THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXIV, NO. 3 MARCH, 1956

CONTENTS

Our Prayer for The Holy Father . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 145

The Immaculate Conception and the Living Church. Part II . . . . . . *Thomas Urban Mullaney, O.P.* 154

Date and Unicity of the Exodus . . . . *Robert North, S.J.* 161

The Religious Situation in France . . . . *Henri Blanc* 183

Co-Operation of Catholics in Non-Catholic Religious Activities. Part II . . . . . . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 190

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
Walter J. Schmitz, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Substitution of an Innocent Victim for a Condemned Person 201

The Publication of the Collection 202

The Quantity of Wine for Mass 203

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1956 by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Oratio Imperata and the New Regulations 204

Newly Ordained Indulgence 206

Ordinary's Anniversary Prayer 206

Sung Mass 207

Tenebrae Services 207

ANALECTA

Review of Recent Roman Documents
Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm. 208

BOOK REVIEWS

The Heart of Father Damien, *by Vital Jourdan* 211

The New Testament, *Translated by James A. Kleist and Joseph L. Lilly* 212

Institute of Spiritual Theology

Fifth Summer Session

July 9 to August 3

DOMINICAN HOUSE OF STUDIES

River Forest, Illinois

An integrated course in spiritual theology and allied subjects for the spiritual director offered to all priests and professed brothers by a staff of Dominican Theologians.

Full course complete in three summer sessions.

Limited accommodations for resident students.

For information and prospectus write to

Father T. M. Sparks, O.P.,
Dominican House of Studies,
River Forest, Illinois.

OUR PRAYER FOR THE HOLY FATHER

Deus, omnium fidelium pastor et rector, famulum tuum Pium quem pastorem Ecclesiae tuae praeesse voluisti, propitius respice: da ei, quaesumus, verbo et exemplo, quibus praeest, proficere; ut ad vitam, una cum grege sibi credito, perveniat sempiternam. Per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum Filium tuum, qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate Spiritus Sancti Deus: per omnia saecula saeculorum.

On two days during this month of March, the priests of the Roman rite will say this collect *"Deus, omnium fidelium"* in addition to the other collects ordinarily required by liturgical law in the celebration of the Mass. March 2, 1956, is the seventeenth anniversary of Pope Pius XII's election to the office of Sovereign Pontiff. It is also his eightieth birthday. March 12 of this year is the seventeenth anniversary of his coronation.

This collect is a part of the public prayer of the Catholic Church. As such, it is the expression of the Church's own hope, a hope animated and motivated by charity and enlightened by divine faith. Essentially, of course, it is an act of religion or of worship. It is one of those acts in which the Church works to pay God the debt of recognition and gratitude due to Him. But, precisely as an act of prayer, a *petitio decentium a Deo,* this collect acknowledges God's sovereign excellence by begging Him to grant a benefit His revealed message has taught us to desire and to appreciate as a favor available to us only through the power of His grace.

The petition expressed in the collect *"Deus, omnium fidelium"* manifests a wish or desire that pertains to the realm of Christian hope. This theological virtue inclines or disposes the will to have confidence in God that we may obtain from Him the good which is supremely difficult of attainment, eternal life, together with the graces required to arrive at it. Consequently, in this collect, as in the Lord's Prayer itself, and in all the public prayers of the Catholic Church, we ultimately ask God for the gift of eternal life, for ourselves and for those associated with us in Our Lord.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Fenton, *The Theology of Prayer* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1939), pp. 88 ff.

The Catholic Church's hope is animated by the virtue of charity. In the final analysis, the Church desires and asks for things in prayer because, loving the Triune God with the supernatural affection of charity, it cannot help desiring and petitioning for these things. Thus the Catholic Church wants and petitions for a particular set of favors in the collect *"Deus, omnium fidelium"* precisely because the love of charity for God Himself demands and orders such desires and petitions.

So it is that on the anniversaries of the election and the coronation of the Sovereign Pontiff the liturgical law of the Western Church commands its priests to perform the basic work of Christian charity in behalf of the Vicar of Christ on earth. In this act of prayer, enlightened as it is by God's supernatural revelation, we find expressed the basic purpose and function of the papacy itself. The truth of divine faith shows us that the successful accomplishment of this purpose is a highly desirable good, and something which can be achieved, but only through the merciful and omnipotent force of God's grace. The impulse of Christian charity, of true love of friendship with God in Christ, compels us to long for and to petition from God Himself the accomplishment of this end. The added collect in the Masses on the second and the twelfth of this month of March constitutes the Church militant's expression of love for and loyalty to the man on whose shoulders God Himself has placed the most terrible responsibility imposed upon anyone on this earth: the duty of acting as the shepherd for and of guarding and feeding the sheep of His flock.

In this way the recitation of the collect *"Deus, omnium fidelium"* at the Masses on March 2 and March 12 is a gloriously important tribute of loyalty and affection for the Vicar of Christ on earth from his brother priests and from the rest of the faithful. Furthermore, in this formula of prayer, we find delineated in the light of the Church's treasure of divine public revelation the basic meaning of the Holy Father's essential function within God's supernatural kingdom on earth. The truths of divine faith thus set forth within the collect *"Deus, omnium fidelium"* formulate and vivify the attitude of the faithful towards our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII. The desires for him and for ourselves which we express in this collect are those which Our Lord Himself wills that we should nurture and work for as loyal children of His Church.

In one of the most brilliant articles of his *Summa theologica,* St. Thomas Aquinas analyzes and interprets one of the collects in the Roman Missal in terms of the four parts of prayer, obsecration, oration, postulation, and thanksgiving.[2] The particular collect St. Thomas uses as an example in this instance is that of the Mass of Trinity Sunday. The *"Deus, omnium fidelium"* is manifestly patient of analysis along exactly the same lines. Through such an analysis, the priests and the people of the Catholic Church can see with a clarity otherwise impossible to achieve the sentiments they should have for the Vicar of Christ on earth.

In the technical language of the *Summa theologica,* the term *"oratio"* refers both to prayer itself, the *petitio decentium a Deo,* and to a part of the complete petition addressed to God. As a part of a formula of prayer, the *oratio* is the actual consideration of God to whom the prayer is being offered. In the prayer for the Pope, we, the members of Our Lord's Mystical Body, ask a favor of God Himself.

Thus we take explicit cognizance of the fact that the good we desire for the Sovereign Pontiff is something which, in the last analysis, can be obtained only by the favor of God, our Creator and the Head of the supernatural order. Since the measure of our affection is the value of the good we will effectively to the object of our love, this is an indication of the fact that our love for the Holy Father, the affection that motivates our prayer for him, is the supernatural affection of charity.

As St. Thomas explains it, in every fully organized petition to God offered by the Catholic Church, there is a mention of the reasons that serve to justify the making and the granting of the request. One of these reasons has to do with the individual making the petition. The other is the reason why God Himself may be considered as willing to grant what we ask of Him. The first of these is the act of thanksgiving. The second is that part of the process of prayer which St. Thomas designated as the *obsecratio.*

No individual can properly address a petition to any superior if he has previously been the recipient of favors from that superior and is not grateful for those favors. Obviously this holds true especially in the case of prayers or petitions addressed to God Himself. Hence this collect *"Deus, omnium fidelium"* embraces a manifestation of our gratitude to God for the great favor He has shown us. We would immediately disqualify ourselves as petitioners in favor of the Roman Pontiff were we not to show ourselves thankful for this great gift.

---

[2] Cf. *Summa theologica,* II^{a}-II^{ae}, q. 83, a. 17. St. Thomas takes these four terms from *I Tim.,* 2:1.

We show our gratitude to God in this act of petition when we address Him as "the Shepherd and the Ruler of all the faithful."

In speaking of God as "the Ruler of all the faithful," we are actually making an act of faith in and thanksgiving for that portion of His revealed message that concerns the Church, His supernatural kingdom on earth. We are taking cognizance of the fact that, according to His own teaching, there exists in this world a social unit or group of which He is, in a special and supernatural way, the Sovereign Ruler. In other words, in this acknowledgment that God is actually the Supreme Lawgiver of all the faithful, we are recognizing the Church, the *congregatio fidelium,* for what He has really told us it is, the company of His chosen people, the Israel of God. We are professing our belief that the Church is the society within which God dwells and over which He reigns as King. We acknowledge that the members of the Church are the men and women who have professed their acceptance of His revealed message, and who have thus manifested their acceptance of the revealed and supernatural law contained within that message. God is the Ruler and the King of this society in that, by His law and His grace, he directs His people to their ultimate and eternal happiness.

As the Creator and Lord of all men, God calls all men into the company of the faithful, within which they are to dwell as His subjects in a special and supernatural way. In taking cognizance of this body of truth, the Church appeals to Him as its Divine Ruler, and thus, by clear and immediate implication, it shows its gratitude to Him for the inestimable treasures He has bestowed upon it. And, through this act of thankfulness, the Church shows itself well disposed to ask for and to receive the favor it seeks from God for its Sovereign Pontiff.

When, in the collect for the Pope, the priest addresses God as the Pastor or "the Shepherd of all the faithful," it is taking cognizance of words employed by the Son of God Himself. He has told us: "I am the good shepherd."[3] Indeed, the metaphor of the shepherd and the sheep is an instrument He used quite frequently in His work of explaining the relations between the members of His Kingdom, His followers, and Himself.

The *obsecratio,* as a part of Christian prayer, is the mention of the motive by reason of which God is considered as willing to grant the petition itself. The supernatural graces or favors of God come to His adopted children by reason of the merciful and redemptive act of Jesus Christ Our Lord. The *obsecratio* of the prayer *"Deus, omnium fidelium,"* like that of many of the Church's other liturgical formulae, is the appeal to God "through Our Lord Jesus Christ, Thy Son, who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost, God forever and forever."

In making this appeal to God, we acknowledge that the favor we ask for the Sovereign Pontiff is something which is ordered to the purpose of the Incarnation and of the Redemption. The only gift we should ask of God in and through Our Divine Lord should be something meant to contribute towards the glory of the Blessed Trinity. It should, in other words, be something necessary for or conducive to the attainment of the Beatific Vision. This is the purpose which Our Lord came into the world to attain for sinful man. By His death he earned for man the forgiveness of sin, the life of grace, and the ultimate flowering of that life of grace, the eternal possession of the Beatific Vision in which the Triune God is glorified.

In the *obsecratio* of this prayer for the Pope, the Church renews its act of divine faith by professing its acceptance of the truths of the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption. It manifests the glorious truth of the Blessed Trinity in its statement that the Son of God remains, together with God the Father forever God, in the unity of the Holy Ghost. It asserts the mystery and the dogma of the Incarnation when it designates Jesus Christ its Head as God, the Son of the Father, and declares that He is united forever as God with the Father and the Holy Ghost. It professes the truth of the Redemption by calling the Son "Our Lord." Jesus Christ was Lord of all the created universe by reason of His divinity. Nevertheless He has likewise earned or won the position of Lord of all things, and in particular of Lord within His Church, through the power of His passion and death.

---

[3] *John,* 10: 11.

And, in a very special way, the *obsecratio* of the prayer *"Deus, omnium fidelium"* manifests the confidence and belief of the Church in Our Lord's own promise. He has told us, as it is recorded in the Gospel according to St. John: "if you ask the Father any thing in my name, he will give it you."[4]

The heart of the prayer is, of course, the *postulatio,* the actual expression to God of the wish we are asking Him to grant to us. In the collect *Pro Papa* we beg Him: "look kindly on Thy servant Pius, whom Thou hast wished to set as shepherd over Thy Church." In this general petition, the Church takes cognizance of the fact that God's love, unlike the love in His creatures, actually produces in its beneficiary the good which is its object. A creature's affection for a person or a thing is dependent upon the existence of good within the thing loved. God, on the other hand, in the very act of loving His creature, produces in that creature the good in terms of which the creature is worthy of love. The Church first offers this petition in a general way in order to show that the favor it seeks from God for the Roman Pontiff is something that will be produced through and in God's love for him.

The explicit and detailed petition the Church makes to God in favor of the Roman Pontiff is contained in these words: "Grant him, we beseech Thee, that by word and example he may benefit those over whom he is placed, so that he, together with the flock entrusted to him, may attain to everlasting life."

This, in the last analysis, contains the essential function of the papacy. One man, the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, has been set in charge of Our Lord's Church militant so that, through his words and his example, he and the flock for which he has been made responsible may arrive at the possession of the Beatific Vision. The petition contained in this collect brings out the divinely revealed fact that the Roman Pontiff is not only commissioned by God and endowed with genuine jurisdictional authority over the followers of Christ, but is also made responsible for the spiritual guidance and direction of all the faithful. Moreover, it puts things in their proper perspective, and indicates that the imposition of the responsibility is the root and basis of the authority the Holy Father possesses.

---

[4] *John,* 16: 23.

The collect *"Deus, omnium fidelium"* breathes the spirit of the very words by which Our Lord constituted St. Peter, and in him his successors in the Roman episcopate, as His vicar on earth.

> When therefore they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these: He saith to him: Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my lambs.
>
> He saith to him again: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? He saith to him: Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my lambs.
>
> He said to him the third time: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he had said to him the third time: Lovest thou me? And he said to him: Lord, thou knowest all things: thou knowest that I love thee. He said to him: Feed my sheep.[5]

The collect for the Pope recalls these words by designating the Roman Pontiff as the "shepherd" of God's Church. It speaks, furthermore, of the "flock" entrusted to his care. Actually, then, this prayer for the Pope is a petition that God's will in the establishment of the papacy, expressed in those words of Jesus Christ, Our Lord, be accomplished.

It is God's will that through Our Lord's Incarnation, the people who follow Him may have eternal life. "I have come," Our Lord said, "that they may have life and may have it more abundantly."[6] It is interesting to note, incidentally, that He put these words into a context in which He had been using the shepherd-sheep analogy to explain what He was doing for those whom the Father had brought to Him.

Our Lord brought out this fact that He had come to bring men to eternal life in the opening words of His sacerdotal prayer, the prayer in which He expressed the very purpose of His passion and death.

> These things Jesus spoke: and lifting up his eyes to heaven, he said: Father, the hour is come. Glorify thy Son, that thy Son may glorify thee.

---

[5] *John,* 21: 15-17.

[6] *John,* 10: 10.

> As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he may give eternal life to all whom thou hast given him.
>
> Now this is eternal life: That they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.[7]

When Our Lord commanded St. Peter to act as shepherd for His lambs and His sheep, He was ordering the Prince of the Apostles to act as His vicar on earth. The responsibility He gave to St. Peter almost two thousand years ago now rests on the shoulders of Pius XII, the successor of St. Peter as Bishop of the city of Rome. The priest who is privileged to say the collect *"Deus, omnium fidelium,"* and the faithful who are gathered at his Mass, are working in an effective way for the attainment of God's own purpose in the establishment and the preservation of the papacy.

We must not lose sight of the fact that according to Our Lord's own promise, God will grant us anything we ask in His name. It is in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ that the Church asks for Pope Pius XII the success in his high office that the Holy Father himself desires above all else. Our prayers actually exercise an efficient causality in the gaining of this end. Thus the priest who offers this prayer *"Deus, omnium fidelium"* during the sacrifice of the Mass is actually working to achieve the purpose God wills for the papacy, and the purpose to which Pope Pius XII is devoting his life.

All that the Holy Father says and does, all of the accomplishments of his great pontificate, are directed to the end of bringing him, together with the flock entrusted to his care, to the eternal possession of the Beatific Vision. All of the details of administration, all of the allocutions and the encyclicals he has authored, all of the canonizations he has made, even the definition of the dogma of Our Lady's bodily assumption into heaven and the institution of the Holy Year and the Marian Year, have been oriented to this ultimate end of eternal life for his people and for himself, and thus for God's glory.

Now, on the occasion of the Holy Father's eightieth birthday and of the seventeenth anniversary of his election and his coronation, it is the privilege of his priests and his people to offer him their heartfelt congratulations. And, with the recitation of the collect *"Deus, omnium fidelium,"* these congratulations are not mere empty words or idle sentiments. Our prayer for the Holy Father is and will continue to be, in the merciful designs of God's providence, a genuine and powerful aid for the accomplishment of that end to which his life is devoted.

---

[7] *John,* 17: 1-3.

We could wish no higher good to Pope Pius XII than that God should look down with favor on him, that he may, through his word and example, be of benefit to the company over which he presides, and that he may, with the faithful entrusted to his care, attain to everlasting life. We can do him no better service than by offering our heartfelt prayers that this end be realized.

Such is the wish and the prayer of the men of *The American Ecclesiastical Review.*

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION AND THE LIVING CHURCH

Part II

A. THE SOLUTION

In order to show that through her Immaculate Conception Mary is in truth the Mother of the Mystical Body of Christ it must be proved (1) that from Mary's Immaculate Conception there proceeds by way of *efficient causality* activity which is rightly described as (a) conceiving, (b) giving birth to, and (c) nourishing and perfecting the life of the Church; and (2) that through that activity our Lady works for the communication of life which is *specifically similar* to her own Immaculate Conception. Thus it will be shown that our Blessed Mother, through her Immaculate Conception, is to the Church a womanly co-principle in the communication and perfecting of new (divine) life specifically like to her own supernatural life—that she is the Mother of the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ.

Thus four points are to be established: (1) the role of Mary's original grace in the conception of the Church; (2) the role of her Immaculate Conception in the birth of the Church and (3) in the intensifying and perfecting of its life in the various members; finally (4) the exemplarity or finality of the Immaculate Conception with respect to the Church at every stage of its life.

1. The Immaculate Conception and the conception of the Church

By conception we mean a certain absolute initiation of life, the point of beginning whence life can possess an organism still to be formed and developed. It marks not the soul's full enlivening of its completed organism but only a principle of life whence the formation and animation of the body can proceed. And, as we have noted, the maternal function in conception is womanly co-operation in setting up a certain exigency, or need, for the advent of the soul to the body—not, I repeat, to the whole body, but to the principle whence the whole body will be in due time fashioned.

In what then consists the conception of the Church, Mystical Body of Christ? Theologians answer that it is in Mary's conceiving Christ that the Church was conceived.[15] This is most reasonable. For our Lord was conceived by Mary as He is formally and essentially the Saviour; therefore as He is essentially the head of regenerated mankind. Conceiving Him therefore Mary co-operated in the establishment of the origin or principle of the divine life of the entire Mystical Body; and this she did in womanly, because maternal, fashion. In the all-chaste womb of Mary the Church had its first origin, because in her the Spirit was sent into One from whose fulness of life the whole Body was to be enlived. As at natural conception the entire body is not yet actually organized or even existing yet the whole (because indivisible) soul is present; so in Christ conceived by His Virgin Mother there was wholeness of divine life yet to emanate in good time into His Mystical Body which He would fashion.

Yet this explanation is inadequate. It renders understandable the proposition that Mary, conceiving Christ, conceived in principle the *whole* Christ, Head and members. But (a) it renders no account of how Mary's activity at the Annunciation established an exigency of the coming of the soul of the Church; and the constitution of such exigency is the proper notion of conception; and (b) it renders no account of how our Lady's Immaculate Conception is involved in her "conceiving the Mystical Body of Christ."

As to the first point. The initial exigency of the coming of the Soul of life is the meritorious sanctity of the man-Christ. Because this man conceived in Mary's womb is, in Person, true Son of God, He has most strict right to the inheritance of His Divine Father that is, to the enjoyment of the divine good, the possession of God Himself. Now God can be possessed by this Man Christ—or by any man or Angel—only through grace. Hence this man, alone among men and angels, has a strict natural right or claim to divine grace. That right is His Divine Sonship; in view of it the eternal Father could not possibly have withheld grace and the virtues from the human soul of Christ.

But the supernaturally graced Christ in the first instant of His human life, which was also the instant of Mary's consent to the

---

[15] Cf. Merkelbach, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

Incarnation, *merited all grace for all men.* Of Him in that instant it is said: "In the beginning of the book it is written of me that I should do thy will";[16] for in the initial moment of His human life He who came among us precisely as our Saviour (*propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem*) did totally subject Himself, for our salvation, to the will of the Divine Father. That self-subjection is His first merit: there will be innumerable other merits, yes, but this first one is already an infinitely sufficient merit and as such a true claim or title to the reward He shall ask viz. "that they may have life and have it . . . abundantly."[17] For Himself He needed not ask life, for the Spirit of life is already fully within Him; but for the derivation of that Spirit into others He did and would ask.

Notice then that *in the very instant* of Christ's conception there is already a certain exigency of the advent of the Spirit into the Mystical Body yet to be formed. That exigency as it regards the Body as some thing (inadequately) distinct from Christ Himself is a moral need, not physical; for it is Christ's claim in justice, His merit, therefore essentially of the moral order.

Now in the constitution of that moral exigency, that claim, our Lady was associated, and in a properly womanly fashion. For by her co-operation in the Incarnation Mary was formally established in her public offices in the Church as Mother of God, Associate of the divine Redeemer, Queen of Creation. In that instant of consent to the will of God she is already, dependently on Christ, a public, sovereign person in the Christian commonwealth of sanctity, one whose actions therefore are no longer merely the actions of a private person, however holy, but actions which have immediate reference to and influence upon that commonwealth of Christ. In that very instant and forever thenceforth her actions bear specifically upon the common good of Christian society—the common good which is Christ in His fulness of grace and truth—and so have value for, and effect upon, the entire body of the Christian community.

Because, then, Mary's assent "Be it done unto me according to thy word"[18] was an act specified by and, in its order, even constitutive of, the common good of Christendom it ought to have affected all of Christendom. But how? It did not make a body of believers physically to exist; it did not, by physical instrumentality, bestow the Spirit of God upon an as yet unformed body of believers. It was terminated by the physical presence in Mary's most holy womb of the incarnate Son of God: but the physical body of the incarnate Word is not the Mystical Body of Christ. How could her act of consenting affect an as yet unformed Mystical Body? Only by way of merit. Our Lady's deliberate, absolute, profound subjection of herself to all that God had for her decreed was *de congruo* meritorious for the entire Church, as Christ's first human action was *de condigno* meritorious. I say it was meritorious for the whole Church because it was the supernaturally perfect act of one constituted (by that very act) in sovereign power within the Church; but it was meritorious only *de congruo* because Mary is only a created person; and, according to St. Thomas, no created person could condignly merit for the entire human race;[19] nor therefore could such a one condignly merit for the entire Mystical Body. Again the Angelic Doctor teaches that only Christ could condignly merit for all men because He alone is the Head of mankind, to the exclusion of *all others;* therefore He alone could condignly merit for the universal Church.[20]

---

[16] *Psalm* 39:8 f.

[17] *John* 10:10.

[18] *Luke* 1:38.

Her eminent, sovereign dignity therefore gave to Our Lady's act universal meritorious value. It was a claim, *her* claim to the fulfillment of her will. What was her will at that moment? She sought then, as now, the fulfillment of God's purpose in the Incarnation. She sought what God willed in coming among us: "*nostram salutem.*" Since our salvation is only through the Spirit of divine life, she sought His advent among us. Thus her action was a claim to, a moral exigency of, the full advent of the Holy Ghost upon the body of believers that her Son should form, instruct and prepare. Her act of consenting to the Incarnation was thus the establishment of a certain exigency of the animation of the Mystical Body by the Spirit of God. It was therefore like to a conception in the natural order, viz. activity productive of an exigency of the infusion of a living soul into matter.

At once and before any discussion of the relevance of the Immaculate Conception to our Lady's act which merited the

[19] Cf. *III Sent.*, d. 18, q. 1, a. 6.

[20] Cf. *Sum. theol.,* III, q. 19, a. 4.

animation of the Church these points must be made. First, Mary's action in establishing this exigency was specifically womanly. It was womanly because achieved by and through her consent to the womanly office of mother of God, and in view of her womanly dignity as Queen; that is, her womanly sovereignty gave to her action value of such universality as to produce an effect in the entire Church. Secondly, however, the "exigency of animation of the Body by the Holy Spirit" achieved by her action is of the moral order, and in this it differs notably from natural human conception which establishes a physical exigency of God's infusing a soul. In the supernatural order, however, a true physical exigency seems impossible to any mere creature. Physical exigency implies a certain absolute necessity of the production of the formal perfection which will satisfy the exigency: but no mere creature has physical, absolute necessity of, or claim to, supernatural grace. If the creature has such necessity then the order of grace would, contradictorily, not be an order of grace, or gratuity, but an order of necessity. This would imply the positive inherent proportion of the natural to the supernatural, and, ultimately, deny the real distinction between the order of the created and the uncreated. That therefore Mary's activity produces a mere exigency argues not to any imperfection in her activity but only to a general truth, namely the infinite inferiority of the creature in the supernatural order.

Thirdly, Mary's act is not only *womanly* and *exigitive* of the infusion of the Holy Spirit; it is also *co-operative,* i.e. a co-operation with Christ in the production of the exigency in question. Mary's activity was not meritorious of an exigency distinct from that merited by the Saviour. Christ's merit and hers regard the same object, though in different ways. Thus we have explicitly verified Our Lady's consent to the Incarnation that in it is her womanly co-operation in the establishment in the (Mystical) Body of an exigency of the infusion of its divine soul—which means that it adequately satisfied the notion of a true, though spiritual, conception.[21]

---

[21] This discussion points up the necessity of carefully distinguishing those aspects of the Incarnation which regard Christ in His own created nature and those which regard His Mystical Body. The Divine Personality of the Man Christ implies in the humanity of Christ an *absolute* necessity of created

What is the reference of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception to her "conception" of the Mystical Body? The answer is simply that her act of "conceiving the Church" was the grace of her conception at work. For that act was beyond question virtuous; it involved especially an act of obedience imperated by charity. Consequently it was an act elicited by the virtues of her soul; but her virtues are identical with her Immaculate Conception, for they were numerically the same virtues which had been infused into her soul at the first instant of her life. Thus, her consent, which is her conception of the Mystical Body, was efficiently produced by her Immaculate Conception: that consent, that conceiving, was her grace of conception at work, for us.

It is to be noted that in Our Lady's consenting and so conceiving the Mystical Body the habitual grace and virtues whence that consent proceeded was *formally, modally* the grace of her Conception, and not only materially identical with that grace.

For one thing, Our Lady's conception of the Church is inseparable from, it is the meritorious aspect of, her conception of Christ; and in that conception of Christ even the mode of preservation was, by the Divine decree, required in Mary's grace. "It was quite becoming," wrote Pius IX, "that so venerable a Mother be *ever* adorned with the splendor of most perfect holiness." And again "It was quite right that as the only-begotten had a Father in heaven whom the Seraphim extol as thrice-holy, so He should have a mother on earth who would *never* lack the splendor of holiness."[22]

Secondly, and by way of immediate connection between Mary's grace as preservative and the Church, it is most fitting that she who by her personal grace and activity was to be for all a certain origin of sanctity should in her person be graced with sanctity of origin. Conceiving the Mystical Body she conceived in principle all human holiness; it was most fitting—therefore divinely willed—that the grace equipping her for such achievement should include man's definitive triumph of holiness, namely, absolute purity from

---

grace, but only a moral necessity of grace (and the Spirit of grace) in His Church. Similarly, Mary's act of consent terminated in the physical presence to her of the incarnate Son of God, and in her merit, or moral claim, to the animation of His Mystical Body.

[22] *DB,* 1641.

any stain of sin. As in the beginning God, creating Eve, endowed her from the first instant with full maturity and perfection of human life because she was from the outset predestined "the mother of all living," who should therefore *have* all natural life; so it was most fitting that Our Lady be endowed *from the beginning* with *full* maturity of supernatural life precisely because she was the predestined Mother of the Mystical Body. God cannot work by halves; whom He has elected to high destiny He endows with high nobility. To the womanly principle of life He, so to say, had to give fulness of life: for only the perfect is fitly a universal source of perfection.

(*To be concluded*)

THOMAS URBAN MULLANEY, O.P.

Dominican House of Studies
Washington, D. C.

DATE AND UNICITY OF THE EXODUS

Some years ago there appeared in these pages an article bringing the American clergy up-to-date on the vital problem of the date of the Exodus as affected by the excavations of Jericho.[1] Since then Jericho has become the scene of a new excavation, whose results have radically altered the state of the question; radically, but also so *negatively* that it would hardly be worth the trouble to review the whole problem just for that. For a different reason, however, it seems opportune to reopen the question, and that is because non-Catholics with ever-increasing emphasis are tending to maintain that the biblical data postulate a *double* Exodus, each with its independent date and circumstances.

In defending some such double Exodus they ably marshal the very arguments on which *we* must rely for taking our position relative to this fundamental fact of biblical chronology; and the Catholic is left bewildered as to whether it is compatible with our faith to admit such a double Exodus, and if it is, whether it is scientifically commendable to do so; and if for either reason a double Exodus is inadmissible, what position, and with what authority against this looming bulk of non-Catholic competence, are we meanwhile to take with regard to the date of the single Exodus.

BIBLICAL DATES

The Bible does not affirm any connection between the Exodus and any verifiable date of Egyptian history, just as the Egyptian archives thus far discovered describe no event recognizably pertaining to the Exodus. It is true that Ex 12,40 [P] pronounces the duration of the Hebrews' sojourn in Egypt to have been exactly 430 years, but we have no clue as to the presumed or actual date of the descent of Jacob into Egypt, Gn 46,6 (except for what we shall presently say of the Hyksos); and in fact the years of Ex 12,40 are in some authoritative biblical texts[2] interpreted to stretch from *Abraham* to Moses, thereby shortening the Egyptian sojourn by 215 years, just half.[3]

---

[1] William H. McClellan, "Jericho and the Date of the Exodus," *AER,* 88, 1 (Jan. 1933), 80-93.

[2] The Septuagint text of Ex 12,40 (but reading 435 years!) and the Samaritan text; St. Paul's citation in Gal 3,17; so also Josephus, *Antiquities* 2 (318) 15,2 [as against 2 (204) 9,1 which follows Gen 15,13].

It is declared in 3 K 6,1 that the Exodus preceded the Temple of Solomon (968 B.C.) by just 480 years, which would give the extremely precise date of 1448 B.C., just about the time when Amenḥotep II had succeeded to Tḥutmes III. But Couroyer justly notes that these biblical 480 years are unmistakably *symbolic:* exactly one generation (of exactly 40 years, Ex 6,7) for each of the twelve successive high-priests since Aaron; corresponding to the identical figure of 480 years for 12 high-priests affirmed for the period between the Temples of Solomon and Zerubbabel.[4]

It must be observed that 430 (+ 215?) years before 1448 brings us to either 1878 or 2093 B.C. for the date of Abraham. The year 2093 was long considered the "biblical date," whereas scholars today in pursuit of ever-fluctuating theories on Hammurabi (= ? Amraphel Gn 14,1) locate Abraham about 1700 B.C.[5]

Another biblical indication is that *predicted* in Gn 15,13 [E] (= Acts 7,6) for the duration of the Egyptian sojourn: "400 years," which, however, is immediately in Gn 15,16 [E] interpreted to be "4 generations." Apparently it is no more unreasonable to regard "100 years" as a *very* round number for "one generation" (exceptionally, since in the Bible "40 years" is the customary and more appropriate round number for this), than to say outright that the two chronological indications are simply incompatible. Hence Rowley insists on the *brevity* of the Egyptian sojourn; which, he points out, is confirmed by Ex 2,23, and especially by the genealogical details of Ex 2,1; 6,20 [P] which add up to less than 160 years; he concludes not to the superior accuracy of this "short" dating, but rather to the necessity of taking critically into account *all* chronological indications of the Bible.

HYKSOS AND ḪABIRU

Two documented and dated extrabiblical movements are mentioned in the Bible only virtually, that is in terms whose biblical equivalence is vehemently controverted. The descent of Jacob into Egypt, or Isodus,[6] seems to represent a phase of the rise to power there of the alien Semitic Hyksos dynasty about 1700 B.C.; and the enslavement and exodus of the Hebrews seems related to the invasion of Palestine by a slave-race of Ḫabiru under Amen-Ḥotep III and IV before 1370.

---

[3] The sum of 215 years from Abraham to Jacob's descent is obtained by adding the data of Gn 12,4; 21,5; 25,26; 47,9.

[4] B. Couroyer, *L'Exode* (Bible de Jérusalem, Paris 1952) 11. Luc H. Grollenberg, *Atlas de la Bible* (Paris 1955) 31, interprets even more "symbolically": 40 x 12 means "preparation [40]" for a new "adoption [12]"!

[5] See the immensely erudite discussion of Harold H. Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua* (Schweich Lectures 1948; London 1952 = 1950), 57.

Regarding the Hyksos (not "shepherds," as in Josephus' source Manetho, but "foreign chiefs," a term however of very similar pronunciation in Egyptian), we are on relatively secure ground. According to an impressive recent study, it would seem that the Hyksos were not an *invasion,* but a gradual quiet infiltration (from 1900 B.C. on) of Asiatics who by 1700 were influential enough to take over the Egyptian throne.[7] The tribal migration of Jacob may have been a part of this Asiatic infiltration.[8] The rise of Joseph to prominence may plausibly be ascribed to sympathizing Semites already intrenched in the monarchy.

The Hyksos dynasty and its retainers are shown by Egyptian records as expelled into southern Palestine by Aḥmes about 1550, and it would be natural to connect *this* with the Exodus: except that the biblical account insists so strongly that the Pharaoh *did not wish* his now-enslaved Hebrews to depart. It remains legitimate to consider the Aḥmes *dynasty* (18th, including Tḥutmes III and Amen-Ḥotep II) as "the new Pharaoh who took no account of Joseph," Ex 1,8.

Another recent theory, however, proposes that Manetho and other records regarding the violent *expulsion* of the Hyksos are to be accorded no more credence than regarding their violent *invasion;* and that in fact the Hyksos *gradually withdrew* toward

---

[6] The counterpart of *éx-odos* is *eís-odos,* which would normally be anglicized Isodus, as isagogic (*eis* + *agôgê*) or icon (*eikôn*).

[7] Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, "The Hyksos Rule in Egypt," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 37 (1951) 53-71.

[8] H. R. Hall, "The Middle Kingdom and the Hyksos Conquest," *Cambridge Ancient History*^{2} (1924) 1,313: "Between the earlier group vouched for by Manetho [= Apopi I, Neb-Khepesh 'lord of scimitar'] and the later Apopis [II and III], came several less distinguished kings bearing Semitic names, Yeḳeb-hal ('Jacob is god'), Yeḳeb-ba 'al ('Jacob is lord'), 'Ant-hal ('Anath is god'), and then Khian [Seuserenre, who] proclaimed himself as the ḥiḳ-khasut. The alabastron-lid bearing his name found at Cnossus in Crete may well be an importation of his time."

Palestine between the reigns of Seti I and Meneptaḥ (1320-1226), the Hebrews being among them.[9] This view may be regarded with sympathetic caution.

The Ḫabiru are a racial or more probably *social* class (some form of itinerant specialized laborers) found in the whole Middle East from 2000 B.C. to about 1300; but especially in the Amarna letters written from Palestine in Accadian to Pharaoh Amen-Ḫotep IV about 1370, the Ḫabiru appear as a horde of invaders who are just then conquering the Canaanite towns one by one. It is not clear, but cannot be wholly disproved, that the Ḫabiru are at least partially identified not only with the SA.GAZ (a Sumerian value of the same cuneiform sign) but also with the Egyptian *'prw,* Ugaritic *'prm,* and Hebrews ('BRYM): the more especially since "Hebrews" appears in the Bible rather as an inferior social caste designation for the (racial) Israelites.[10] If the Hebrews were taking over Palestine in 1400 (in approximately the manner described in the book of Josue), their Exodus must be dated some forty years earlier under Amen-Ḥotep II, 1450-1425.

---

[9] J. Leibovitch, "Le problème des Hyksos et celui de l'Exode," *Israel Exploration Quarterly* 3 (1953) 110.

[10] A superb bibliographical survey of this problem by Jean Bottéro, *Le problème des Ḫabiru à la 4^{e} Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Cahiers de la Société Asiatique 12, Paris 1954) gives *all* occurrences of these terms, with a standardized numeration (0-193), complete context, and commentary often contributed by eminent colleagues. But pp. xvi and xxx insist that the problem must be wholly solved without prejudicially intruding any question of the biblical Hebrews. Really it seems just as prejudicial to exclude from discussion as decided in advance that the Hebrews are *not* (part of) the Ḫabiru. Admitting that where exegetical or dogmatic positions are at stake there is always a danger of slanting the evidence, we cannot see why the undisputed occurrence of an unassimilated Semitic forced-labor group called 'BRM *is* any less objectively pertinent to the Ḫabiru-texts than are the terms and descriptions applied to the 'PRM, 'PRW, or especially SA.GAZ. This last term (written sometimes SA.GAS, SAG.GAZ, SA-GAZ-ZA, or simply GAZ) is conceded to be nowhere in our sources explicitly equated with *ḫabiru* (written by some Assyriologists *ḫâbiru, ḫapiru,* or *ḫapíru*), and the equation is based only on two not apodictic arguments: 1) in Hittite-Accadian treaties the final lists of divinities alternate SA.GAZ with *Ḫabiru* (pp. xxiii; 82, 159); 2) 'PRM of a Ugaritic tablet occurs as a parallel to SAG.GAZ in a syllabic-cuneiform tablet (pp. xiii; 120). Bottéro's final word concerning the *nature* of this Ḫabiru-group as a "non-ethnic but foreign body" accords with the view of many biblists [adopted also revelant to the "Hebrew 'slave'" in our *Sociology of the Biblical Jubilee* (Rome 1954) 149], that the biblical Hebrews were a branch or phase of the Ḫabiru. Recently, Otto Eissfeldt, "Ugarit und Alalakh," *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 28 (1954) 82, shows that the description of Ḫabiru at Alalaḫ

An inscription of Seti I furthermore names a certain *ísr,* claimed to be the biblical Asher, among the subjugated Asiatic lands between Qadesh-on-the-Orontes and Megiddo.[11] Other alleged allusions to Asher and Zabulon in the Ras Shamra texts and to Dan also as occupying Palestine at that time are less admissible.[12] The Meneptaḥ stele of which we shall presently speak also suggests that there are Israelites in Palestine well before 1230. All of this fits the hypothesis of a connection between the Ḫabiru and the Exodus.

TḤUTMES III AND AKHENATEN

The Ḫabiru-Exodus is further corroborated by the history of two Pharaohs. The predecessor of Amen-Ḥotep II, Tḥutmes III (chief Pharaoh of the dynasty which expelled the Hyksos!) reigned a long time, 1504-1450, as implied in Ex 2,23. During the early part of his reign his co-regent was the Queen Hatshepsut, whose regnal name is the same as that assigned by a frail tradition to the princess who rescued Moses.[13] Bea maintains that the date 1448 B.C. indicated by 3 K 6,1 as the Exodus-date may be considered *either* as the last year of Tḥutmes III *or* as the first year of Amen-Ḥotep II.[14]

If, however, we place the Oppression somewhat *late* in the reign of Tḥutmes III, after the termination of his anti-Semitic Asia

---

well fits the Hebrews of 1 S 14,21 and even the designation of Abraham as a Hebrew in Gn 14,13. Certain (Trans?-)Jordan ‘PRW are mentioned on a stele of Seti I found at BetŠan: Alan Rowe, *Topography and History of Beth-Shan* (Philadelphia 1930) 29.

[11] Alan H. Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica I* (Oxford 1947) 192 gives the arguments for and against finding Asher in the Seti I inscription of Wadi Abbâd; a later reference, *Papyrus Anastasi I* about 1200 B.C., is given in J. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Princeton 1950) 477.

[12] Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua* 34.

[13] Hubert Grimme, *Althebräische Inschriften vom Sinai* (Darmstadt 1923) 64; 95; Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* 9,27,3 [ed. Dindorf, Leipzig, 1877; 1,499] calls the fosterer of Moses "Merris" (with which compare *Maker-re* Hatshepsut).

[14] A. Bea, *De Pentateucho*² (Rome 1933) 191, citing F. X. Kugler, *Von Moses bis Paulus* (Münster 1922) 172, and K. Miketta, *Die Amarnazeit* (Biblische Zeitfragen 1/10, Münster 1908).

campaigns in 1459, then the round number of Ex 7,7 would justify dating the Exodus in 1377 under Akhenaten (= Amen-Ḥotep IV), to whom were addressed some of the Amarna letters; in fact, they are so called because of having been deposited in an archive in the capital which he built for himself brand-new between Thebes and Memphis, and of which the eventually abandoned site came to be called in Arabic ʻAmarnâ.

Akhenaten was a remarkable figure in the religious history of the world. Though of sickly and effeminate character, and of artistic (surrealist!) tastes, he was instrumental (doubtless as a tool in the hands of stronger personalities) in engineering an immense reform of Egyptian polytheism, substituting a cultus of the solar disk (Aten) which is exceedingly akin to monotheism, and is reckoned by Albright to have influenced the monotheism of Moses.[15] According to a recent Catholic study, Akhenaten's *weak character* corresponds exactly to that of the Pharaoh depicted in the Plagues narrative, whilst *only he* of the historic Pharaohs left *no male heir*.[16] It cannot be said, however, that the sum of chronological or doctrinal considerations favor the hypothesis of an exodus under Akhenaten rather than Tḥutmes III or Amen-Ḥotep II: apart from the *geographical* considerations which will presently appear as immensely adverse to all three.

RAMESES II

If we conscientiously endeavor to allot some 400 years (Ex 12,40) between the arrival of Jacob (about 1700 B.C.) and the Exodus, the next Pharaoh after Tḥutmes III who reigned a long time is Rameses II of the 19th dynasty, and his name is exceedingly conspicuous (though in purely geographical aspects) in the

---

[15] W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*^{2} (Baltimore 1946) 169: Akhenaten himself was far too weak and subnormal to have taken an original part in imposing his monotheism. After him it continued to be exploited by Heliopolitan rivals to the Theban priesthood, culminating in "the return to Hyksos traditions and to the cult of the long despised god Seth [Sutekh], the enemy of Horus, which triumphed about 1320 B.C. with the accession of Rameses I" of an old Tanite (probably Hyksos) family which reigned 400 years before the 400-year-stele of Rameses II; p. 206, the Mosaic monotheism was influenced by *Amun* as well as by Aten, but was aniconic.

[16] T. Auer, *Die Pharaonen des Buches Exodus* (Regensburg 1951); the brochure is not impressively documented.

Exodus narrative.[17] In fact, the town built by the slave-labor of the Hebrews is in Ex 1,11 called Ra'amses, which would seem a strange (though not inadmissible) anachronism if it was built at a time when no ruler had yet borne the name of Rameses. Moreover, the scene of the Oppression ("Goshen" to infer from Gn 47,6) is by Gn 47,11 [P] called "the field of Ra'amses," and by Ps 78H,12 "the field of Tanis [H Ṣo'an]."

The site of Tanis is well known in the northeast corner of "greater Goshen," and excavation has revealed there a quantity of obelisks and other monuments of Rameses II so immense that it is difficult of explanation otherwise than as his capital city. It is true that at Qanṭîr some 12 miles south were found more appropriate evidences of a palace; but one may risk combining the two sites into a single royal seat.[18] The reader of the Plagues narrative cannot fail to assume that the Pharaoh is residing not far from the Hebrews; the frequent visits of Moses to his court can hardly be regarded as involving a journey from Goshen (Masẖûṭa) to Luxor (570 miles), Amarna (300), or even Memphis (90). This geographical situation opens out certain wider problems relative to the date of the Exodus which may profitably be discussed here.

GEOGRAPHY OF THE DELTA SOJOURN

Rowley's primary geographical scruple is against an Isodus under the Hyksos. He maintains, "When the Israelites went into Egypt, they were assigned a district far from the court, where the Egyptians would run no risk of contact with the disliked shepherds."[19] It is true that in the verse which he cites, Gn 46,34 [J], Joseph rather brusquely tells his brothers that by stressing their shepherd's trade, they are more sure of securing a habitation in [remote!] Goshen,[20] "for every shepherd is an abomination to the Egyptians"; but Pharaoh uses quite a different terminology in Gn 47,6 [divided between P 6a and J 6b by critics], "The land of Egypt is before thee; in the best of the land establish thy father and thy brethren; let them dwell in the land of Goshen; and if thou knowest that there be among them men of energy, set them as foremen in charge of the cattle which I possess." It may be, of course, that Pharaoh's politeness is here purely diplomatic; but against a too hasty decision it must be noticed that if the Pharaoh who *harbored* the Israelites could not endure the proximity of their herds, it would be strange that the later dynasty which hated the Israelites tolerated their living in the midst of them. We must grant, of course, that as the Hebrews became progressively sedentarized and agricultural, they penetrated ever more and were acceptable neighbors among the Egyptians; nevertheless, at the end of it all their flocks and herds still loom large in their racial character.

---

[17] Alexander Scharff, *Ägypten [und Vorderasien] im Altertum* (Munich 1950) 157, on the basis of thorough chronological researches maintains that the date 1301-1234 for the reign of Rameses II is now confirmed beyond doubt by evidences from both within and outside Egypt.

[18] Albrecht Alt, "Die Deltaresidenz der Ramessiden," *F. Zucker Festschrift* (Berlin 1954) 7.

[19] Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua* 24.

[20] We tend to prefer the spelling of place-names according to the Masoretic text, although it is often demonstrably less faithful than the Septuagint and Vulgate [A. Vaccari, *Lo Studio della Sacra Scrittura* (Rome 1943) 78];

Rowley notes in a footnote that Gn 45,10 calls Goshen *near* the court of Pharaoh, "but there it is in comparison with Palestine." The Hyksos rulers had their capital at Avaris; whose site, truth to tell, is quite unknown, though in very recent years (and despite monumental enigmas) there is a strong trend to locate it at Tanis.[21] We know that a proto-Tanis existed as early as 2300 B.C., but we do not know by what name it was called at that time. The allegedly Hyksos busts found there were later proved to be merely plagiarized originals of Amenemhet III (12th dynasty, 1850), though some other Hyksos monuments from there preserve an undeniable plausibility. Presumably the anonymous town was ***rebuilt*** by the Hyksos under the name of Avaris.[22] Again after 1300, if the prevailing hypothesis be correct, Avaris (together

---

specifically the Septuagint Gesem is claimed to reflect significantly the Egyptian Kesem, name of the Delta-district nearest Sinai: Édouard Naville, "The Geography of the Exodus," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 10 (1924) 28, answering solidly the objections of A. H. Gardiner, as Gardiner to some extent admits on p. 94.

[21] Pierre Montet, *Les énigmes de Tanis* (Paris 1952); so already his "Tanis, Avaris et Pi-Ramsès," *Revue Biblique* 39 (1930) 1-28.

[22] According to Henri Cazelles, *Les Nombres* (Bible de Jérusalem, Paris 1952) 72, it is *this* rebuilding [in which the name of Tanis was not involved] in virtue of which Tanis is in Nm 13,22 declared to have been founded [in 1730], seven years after Hebron.

with Qanṭîr?) was rebuilt under the name of Per-Rameses, and only at some later date did it receive the definitive name of Tanis. All this reconstruction makes rather strong claims on our credulity, but it works out quite consistently and has earned a large measure of acceptance.

And even those who do not locate Avaris at Tanis choose some other spot in the northeast Delta to be suitably near the Hyksos Asiatic base. Hence we may admit that a Hyksos-Pharaoh would have lived at Avaris-Tanis. This is actually *within* the area of "greater Goshen," but the nucleus of Goshen is the Wadi Ṭûmilât around Tell Masẖûṭa, which is generally conceded to be at or near [Reṭâba = ?] Per-Atum, the Pi-Tom of Ex 1,11. Now the distance in a straight line from Tanis to Pi-Tom is not less than thirty miles, which would well justify Joseph's coming by chariot (Gn 46,28) instead of walking, even apart from the pomp imposed by viceroyalty.

Rowley is correct in asserting against Montet that in the biblical narrative the proximity of the Hebrews to the court is *not the same* in the age of Joseph and of Moses. Undoubtedly the Hebrews are living far more thickly mingled with the Egyptians in Moses' day, and also in closer proximity to the court. But this would hold for a small group of families settling thirty miles south of Avaris, then expanding through several generations and finally being resettled in great numbers at Avaris itself precisely for the forced labor of rebuilding it under the name of Per-Rameses. Indeed, the only geographical difficulty this leaves untouched is that of the variant biblical tradition [J] which locates the Israelites in a segregated territory not [as E,P] mingled with the Egyptians, so that some preternatural phenomena can leave the Israelites untouched; but this is a relatively minor problem and capable of a different explanation.

Consequently, geographical factors favor an Isodus under the Hyksos and an Oppression at least partially under Rameses II. If Tḥutmes III is held to be the Oppressor, he must be imagined as having a secondary capital (besides Thebes) at Avaris or more probably at Memphis.[23] This is not an unreasonable postulate, since, in fact, Rameses II carried on an immense activity at Thebes as well as in the Delta; but we have no *positive* literary or archaeological proof of any Delta activity of Ṭhutmes III.

---

[23] S. H. Hooke, *In the Beginning* (Clarendon Bible, 6; Oxford 1947) 117, claims that the dynasty which gave Joseph as wife the daughter of the priest of On could scarcely have been the Hyksos, since they worshiped Seth. The

MENEPTAḤ AND HIS ISRAEL-STELE

The successor of Rameses II, Meneptaḥ 1234-1226, is portrayed in Egyptian history as notably weaker than he, and it is claimed that a number of excavated sites in Palestine show evidence of overthrow just after the close of the Bronze Age (1200). Moreover, a stele of Meneptaḥ is our earliest historical document recording the name of Israel, claimed annihilated by him along with other populations subjugated in Palestine. If Israel is already making war in Palestine during Meneptaḥ's reign, it is difficult to see how the Exodus could have taken place under him; whence Albright maintains that the biblical emigration took place under Rameses II himself.[24] In this case the Oppression may well have been begun under Seti I or even Horemheb.[25]

---

argument seems frail, but attention may be drawn to the biblical mention of On = Heliopolis, in the close proximity of Memphis and possibly not far from where the Pharaoh resided.

[24] Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*^{2} 194; so Couroyer, *L'Exode,* 13; V. Laridon, "Quaestio chronologiae biblicae de tempore Exodi ex Aegypto," *Collationes Brugenses* 45 (1949) 67. Laridon on p. 63 notes that de Vaux, Abel, and Albright approve and independently corroborate the well-known contention of Nelson Glueck that the Moabite, Edomite, and Ammonite realms with whom Moses had to deal in Transjordan were not yet in (sedentary) existence before 1300.

[25] Horemheb, general under Tut-Ankh-Amon, became Pharaoh 1345-1318 and founder of the 19th Dynasty. He is the choice of Henri Cazelles, *Études sur le Code de l'Alliance* (Paris 1946) 179, as the Pharaoh whose reign is most suitable to account for juridic influences upon the boyhood of Moses as a court scribe: therefore during the Oppression [Ex 2,2.11], with Exodus early in the reign of Rameses II. Horemheb was a new king, the founder of a new dynasty. The widespread conviction that only a *single* Oppression-Pharaoh preceded the Exodus-Pharaoh is not really proved; also unproved is the reference of "that long time" of Ex 2,23 to the duration of that Pharaoh's reign. The stele of Meneptaḥ, by not writing after "Israel" the determinative for "country," seems to imply that Israel was not yet sedentary: therefore not installed with the 1370 Ḫabiru. The archaeologically-discovered conditions of Palestine and Transjordan, as outlined by de Vaux in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 56 (1938) 233-237, well fit an Occupation about 1230.

But many authorities have found it plausible to refer this "defeat" of Israel to their "expulsion" from Egypt into the Sinai-Negeb desert where they faced a presumably certain death. An interesting but less accepted possibility is that Meneptaḥ refers to a defeat of Israel at Ḥorma by subjects of the Pharaoh as recorded in Num 14,45, Dt 1,44.[26] Even more ingenious and less accepted is Naville's view that the Israel stele does not record any actual Asiatic *expedition* of Meneptaḥ, but merely enumerates the peoples whose helplessness guarantees the safety of the Pharaoh.[27] Less attention need be paid to the claim of Eerdmans that the Israel-stele proves the Hebrews *still* in Palestine, the Isodus having *not yet* taken place.[28]

We may mention here, if only to justify our spelling Meneptaḥ (the *r* of the Egyptian written-form Merneptaḥ is known from other documents to have been *silent*), the highly interesting theory that the village of Mê-Neptoaḥ (Arabic Liftâ) just west of Jerusalem, known to Jos 15,9, bears a mildly modified vocalization of the name Meneptaḥ,[29] which we can well imagine the freed Israelites giving to one of their settlements either as a humorous vaunt or as a peace-overture toward the regime which in spite of all was still the strongest political force in Palestine.

The majority of interpreters today, especially Catholics, while acknowledging fully the indications pointing to an Exodus around 1400, nevertheless maintain Rameses II as Pharaoh of at least a part of the Oppression. They tend, though with less uniformity, to date the actual Exodus rather under Meneptaḥ.[30]

---

[26] J. S. Griffiths, *The Exodus in the Light of Archaeology* (London 1923) 53.

[27] Édouard Naville, "Did Menephtah Invade Syria?" *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 2 (1915) 201.

[28] B. D. Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien 2. Die Vorgeschichte Israels* (Giessen 1909) 67. He correlatively dates the Exodus after Rameses IV, probably under Rameses XI, 1130 (p. 72).

[29] Franz von Calice, "König Menephthes im Buche Josua?" *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 6 (1903) 224; praised by Martin Noth, Josue^2 (Tübingen 1953) 88.

[30] Our attention has been called to the provisional acceptance of this view by the eminent Egyptologist abbé Étienne Drioton, "La date de l'Exode," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 35 (1955) 36-50; he finds an allusion to the flight of the Israelites into the Sinai-desert, in the words of the Meneptaḥ-stele, "Israel is destroyed, it has no *seed*" (i.e., not *progeny,* but *cereal-food* to nourish itself).

JERICHO

A vital factor in all discussions of the date of the Exodus prior to 1952 A.D. was the results of excavation at Jericho.[31] A mud-brick wall there was confidently and with perfect harmony asserted by the experts Garstang, Vincent, and Albright to be the wall destroyed by Josue; and, in fact, it showed unmistakable traces of a violent destruction. But as to the *date* of that destruction there was disagreement. Vincent noted that *some* extremely few scraps of pottery found on or near the site (but not in any dependence upon "the Wall" itself) were undeniably of the type in vogue from 1400 to 1200 B.C., and he (. . . therefore!) maintained that the wall was destroyed about 1250.[32] Garstang, though perhaps a less experienced ceramicist,[33] with perfect reason, countered that these few scraps were not a valid chronological indicator in comparison with the quantities of pottery whose date was certainly prior to 1400, or by a margin of error not later than 1375. Albright, an eminently qualified expert, took a middle position, and drew sweeping conclusions from the fact that Jericho was certainly destroyed sometime around 1325.

---

[31] A prior campaign was conducted by Ernst Sellin in 1907 with the primitive methods then inevitably available, called "pipe-line fashion" by G. E. Wright, "Epic of Conquest in Palestine," *Biblical Archaeologist* 3 (1940) 32^{11}, as contrasted with Garstang's "onion-skin fashion."

[32] L.-Hugues Vincent, "Céramique et chronologie . . . des ruines de Jéricho," *Revue Biblique* 41 (1932) 268. So far as can be discovered, neither here nor anywhere else does Vincent call to public attention that he here tacitly abandons his earlier insistent contention that this "Josue-wall" was in fact prior in construction to the outer stone glacis which he had advocated as the "Josue-wall" in "La chronologie des ruines de Jéricho," *RB* 39 (1930) 409. Since the 1952 Kenyon campaign proved quite correct his original contention, his earlier volte-face is now shown to be *inutilis immo nociva.* We beg pardon for feeling obliged to stress this in view of the fact that his masterful articles remain the best summary of the pre-1952 situation (which lamentably will continue to dominate exegesis for at least a decade to come), and a misunderstanding of his change of position would be bewildering.

[33] In his official accounts of the Jericho excavation published in the Liverpool *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 19 (1932) to 23 (1936), John Garstang often leaves responsibility for the pottery to the signed articles of J. P. Droop, G. M. Fitzgerald, and I. Ben-Dor; but a rather disquieting intervention on his part (not, however, related to the biblical era) is noted by C. Schaeffer in *Ugaritica I* (Paris 1939) 8^4. A. Lucas, "The Date of the Exodus," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 73 (1941) 114, naively recommends accepting the date of Garstang and Rowe on the ground that both are Egyptologists while Vincent and [!] Albright are not.

It seemed a simple thing to decide the all-important date of the Exodus by undertaking a further excavation at Jericho to find out whether or not there was pottery of 1250 B.C. This was undertaken by the British School of Archaeology under Miss Kathleen M. Kenyon in 1952, with the collaboration of the American Schools of Oriental Research. In the first two seasons the present writer was privileged to collaborate actively, and to verify beyond reasonable doubt that the mud-brick wall proclaimed to be "of Josue" was, in fact, destroyed (sometimes violently) and rebuilt some seventeen times, *all* prior to 2000 B.C.[34] This conclusion must be regarded as apodictic in what concerns that particular wall. There are several other walls, but these too are provably prior to 1600. In addition, there was not found at any other point on the site material which can be ascribed to the Late Bronze period at all (1600-1200!); this is a purely negative argument, but it has been confirmed rather steadily in a wide variety of soundings, with only a negligibly slight exception in 1954.[35]

Thus the archaeological position of Jericho is approximately that of 'Ay: the two chief cities mentioned as stormed by Josue contain, in fact, no evidences of habitation either at that time or for many years previous. Leaving to its own place the solution of this problem as regards the historicity of Josue, our conclusion for the date of the Exodus is a purely negative but important one: whatever weight has hitherto been attached to the archaeologically-ascertained date of the destruction of the "Josue-wall" of Jericho must be ruthlessly eliminated from consideration.

---

[34] R. North, "The 1952 Jericho-Sultan Excavation," *Biblica* 34 (1953) 1-12; Miss Kenyon's official account is in *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 84 (1952) 62-82 and 85 (1953) 81-95; for the account of the American School director, A. D. Tushingham, see *BASOR* 127 (1952) 5-16, and especially *Biblical Archaeologist* 16 (1953) 45-67.

[35] The only explanation thus far offered is the very tentative one that the site continued to be inhabited within the latest of the Middle Bronze walls (which strangely shows no datable sign of rebuilding or repair within four hundred years, as contrasted to the seventeen rebuildings of the Early Bronze rampart), but that *absolutely all evidence* of Late Bronze occupation has been swept away from the site by some cataclysmic natural occurrence (of which no evidence can be indicated). This hypothesis, in itself entirely admissible, would play havoc with principles hitherto considered normative in determining whether or not a given Palestine site can be considered as having been occupied in a biblical period under the name with which it is proposed to connect it. The only apparent alternative is the even more distressing one of imagining that Old Testament Jericho was not at Tell es-Sultân (whose lacuna incidentally embraces the whole period relative to Ḥiel 3 K 16,34), but at some much less suitable site of the vicinity.

In default of the paramount evidence from Jericho and ʻAy, an extreme reserve must be commended in attributing independent force to the alleged destruction of Lakiš-Duwayr and Debir-Mirsim at an archaeologically-provable date said to correspond only to the conquering entry of Israelites into Canaan: the more so since excavation has proved so strikingly that the normal pattern of Israelite infiltration was simply to occupy the less-favored sites in the interstices of Canaanite settlement, thus gradually attaining a foothold of coexistence with as little outright conflict as possible.

DOUBLE EXODUS

To the conflicting evidences of a 15th and a 13th century Exodus corresponds a double series of Sinaitic geographical indications in the biblical narrative (or perhaps more exactly in the presumed Pentateuch-documents): some apparently postulating a southern crossing, a Sinai deep in the south of the peninsula, and an entry into Palestine from ʻAqaba-Moab; others implying rather a steadily northerly Exodus with a crossing at Pelusium, a Sinai near Qadeš-Barneʻ, and an entry via BeerŠebaʻ and Hebron. Hence it need not surprise us that the major non-Catholic authorities who have probed the question conclude that there were *two* Exodi, *both* of which (with or without corresponding double "Isodus") are "unintentionally" recorded in the Bible despite the efforts of its compilers to harmonize them into one.

Already in 1909, Toffteen maintained with admirable simplicity that J E D describe an Isodus of 1877 B.C. with Exodus in 1447; while to the P document the Isodus was in 1340 and the Exodus in 1144. Since both Exodi were caused by a pharaonic oppression, and the second was fostered by leaders who (whether by chance or for the symbolism) took names like Moses, the inspired narratives were quite accurate, though they have been combined in a manner to cause invincible error. Or rather, to put the matter more justly, the error was not really invincible since after all

Toffteen has seen through it and recaptured for posterity the information which the inspired author meant to convey.[36]

In the 1917 Schweich Lectures, Burney maintained one Isodus contemporary with the Hyksos but long before Joseph; to this corresponded an Exodus known as the expulsion of the Hyksos. Only after the Ḫabiru invaded Palestine in the Amarna-era did the Joseph-tribes break off from the others and go down into Egypt about 1400. They were joined by Levi and Simeon, and made a common Exodus with them in 1220 under Meneptaḥ; but whereas these headed directly for Palestine from Quadeš (with Juda, who had been lingering there), the Josephites, taking with them *some* Levites as custodians of the Ark, approached Palestine from Moab.[37]

An important research by Meek in 1936, recently published in a thoroughly revised edition, maintained a minor Isodus and Exodus with the Hyksos. Then, in connection with the Ḫabiru, the Amarna letters are claimed to describe the conclusion of a migration (but not an Exodus from Egypt) of Joseph-tribes under Josue about 1400. After 1300 occurred *another* Exodus (of Levites) under Moses, which entered Juda from the south about 1200.[38]

It will be, perhaps, pardonable here to present the position of Albright as it has been tracked down with Rowley with embarrassing but flattering relentlessness through a forest of large and small articles containing, despite a distressing number of inconsistencies or evolutions, the magisterial authority of a rare first-hand competence in the numerous specialized archaeological and linguistic skills involved. The Josephids were a part of the Hyksos movement, but in a manner altogether unexplained in the biblical narrative they were already back in Samaria and strongly intrenched there *under Josue* when in 1400 under the name of Ḫabiru they began conquering the cities of southern Palestine. The Leah-tribes (Levites), though they apparently entered Egypt with the Josephids and the Hyksos about 1720 B.C., remained in Egypt until they were oppressed by Seti I and led out by Moses early in the reign of Rameses II.[39]

---

[36] Olaf A. Toffteen, *The Historic Exodus* (1909); we confess that we find it difficult to reconcile Rowley's severe judgment on Toffteen (*From Joseph to Joshua* 6n) with his own eventual contention, p. 147f: "in the Biblical traditions we have combined, in what appears to be a single account, the reminiscences of a twofold entry into the land. While the traditions are not scientific history, of course, I find in them historical substance in themselves."

[37] Charles F. Burney, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*^{3} (London 1921) 46; 95.

[38] Theophile J. Meek, *Hebrew Origins*^{2} (New York 1950) 18; 43. Similar views are cited by Rowley from D. D. Luckenbill, "On Israel's Origins," *American Journal of Theology* 22 (1918) 24-53; J. M. Powis Smith, *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 32 (1916) 81-97; 35 (1918) 1-19; and C. A. Simpson, *Revelation and Response in the Old Testament* (London 1947), who adds that Moses was never in Egypt but met the emigrating Israelites at Qadeš.

Rowley's own theory is that there was only a single *true* Isodus, of Joseph and related tribes, under Akhenaten from 1370 to 1360 B.C.; the sojourn of these Hebrews in Egypt lasted only four generations, until in 1300 they were oppressed under Rameses II and in 1230 occurred the Exodus; after only *two* (not forty) years of desert-wandering, Josue led these Joseph-tribes from Moab into central Palestine. Rowley allows an interval of nearly 300 years between Joseph and the migration of Abraham from Ḫarran in 1650 B.C. At the time of the Amarna archive (1400 B.C.), there are Hebrew groups (apparently *not* escaping from Egypt) who after a forty-year sojourn around Qadeš press northwards under the name of Ḫabiru; while the Israelite tribes of Dan, Asher, and Zebulon, under the name of SA.GAZ as distinct from Ḫabiru, press southward from Galilee.[40]

---

[39] Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua* 145, constructing a mosaic out of Albright's "Archaeology and the Date of the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," *BASOR* 58 (1935) 10-18 and other relevant Albright writings, a mere 51 of which are cited in the Bibliography. Albright thereupon, in a review of Rowley's book *Gnomon* 23 (1951) 397, expressed considerable satisfaction both with Rowley's fairness to him and with Rowley's own dates for Abraham 1650 and the Josue invasion 1230, but not with many *intervening* dates. A memorable gem occurs on p. 398 of Albright's review: "It may safely be said that the original historical picture was closer to the tradition of the Pentateuch than any modern 'critical' reconstruction has been, including both Rowley's current effort and various more concise efforts of [Albright himself]."

[40] Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua* 164. Views similar to some of Rowley's are to be found in R. Henderson, "Akhnaton and Moses," *Church Quarterly Review* 97 (1924) 120: under Akhenaten (whose monotheism incidentally influenced Moses), Leah-tribes *which had never been in Egypt* entered Palestine and afforded occasion for the Ḫabiru-mentions and the Meneptaḥ-stele; but the true Exodus of Rachel-tribes from Egypt took place in 1200.

Finally there appeared in respectful dependence upon Rowley an alternative solution by Rowton.[41] It accords to ceramic chronology an authority wholly out of proportion to the obscurities of the situation; the 13th-century destruction of Jericho is confidently maintained contemporaneous with the destruction of Bethel, "almost certainly" described in the Bible under the name of 'Ay.[42] Rowton next premises a summary proof that a pre-1320 date of the Exodus is excluded. It is then proposed that a *first* Exodus of Josephids, headed by Aaron without any connection with Moses or Josue, and loaded with presents by friendly co-operative Egypt, produced the destruction of Jericho and Bethel around 1280. The *second* Exodus, chiefly of Levites descended from the captives imported by Meneptaḥ, headed by both Moses and Josue, leaving Egypt when it was harassed by invading Sea-Peoples under Rameses III in 1170, entered Palestine only in 1125, destroyed Debir (spelled Mersim), and carried on the *Judges'* campaigns, but did not receive any tribal heritage since the territory was all occupied already.[43] The proposal is an interesting and carefully-reasoned one, but it can hardly be said to have imposed a *pax romana* upon the conflicting elements which were clamoring for a hearing.

CATHOLIC RESERVES

We may risk saying at once that the hypothesis of a double exodus, even in the virtual form admitted by Rowley, will have a hard time winning the approval of Catholics: and this in spite of the adherence and original contribution of the eminently secure Fernández.[44] First of all the double-exodus theories are so varied and irreconcilable as to constitute thus far at least their own best refutation. However incoherent and ill-reconcilable we admit the biblical data to be, we find the incoherencies only multiplied in jettisoning the not merely single but *unique* Exodus which is the cornerstone of biblical tradition.

---

[41] M. B. Rowton, "The Problem of the Exodus," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 85 (1953) 46-60.

[42] This original and plausibly-founded theory of Albright merits to the full the title of a working hypothesis, but it has serious rivals (Vincent, Kopp) and in any case belongs ultimately to the realm of conjecture.

[43] The date 1170 is also proposed (as alternative to 1407 or 1095) by R. Fruin, "De bijbelsche Chronologie van den uittocht uit Egypte tot den bouw van den eersten Tempel" *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift* 23 (1934) 316-325.

[44] Andrés Fernández, "¿Hubo Éxodo premosaico?" *Estudios Bíblicos* 3 (1932) 161. Admitting that Ex and the earlier books give not the slightest hint of a partial pre-Mosaic Exodus, he nevertheless finds in 1 Chr 7, 20-29 *sons of Ephraim* around Bethel and Gath *already during Ephraim's lifetime;* this altogether accords (p. 164) with the facility of transit from Egypt

A more proximate obstacle for Catholics consists in the fact that most double-exodus theories call into question the historic reality of the Twelve Tribes or sons of Jacob all leaving Palestine and entering Egypt together, and later returning together to Palestine. On this point attention must be called to a decree of the Biblical Commission condemning in the severest terms a work which maintained "against the unmistakable witness of the Sacred Books, among other things . . . that not the whole Israelite nation but only a part, chiefly the tribe of Joseph, entered Egypt . . . wherefore the author at least implicitly denies the dogma of biblical inspiration and inerrancy; altogether neglects the norms of Catholic interpretation; contradicts the Catholic doctrine most clearly proposed in the Eycyclicals *Providentissimus Deus* and *Spiritus Paraclitus.* Therefore the work deserves, *omnimodam reprobationem,* every known form of disapproval": . . . and serves the Commission as an occasion to remind Catholic exegetes that "the true sense of the Scripture must be held to be that which Holy Mother the Church has held and holds . . . with the consequence that no one may propose an interpretation against this sense, or against the unanimous consent of the Fathers either."[45]

Since the other points singled out for condemnation have either been embraced by Catholic authors in less offensive form (admission of sources in the Pentateuch with full awareness of the 1906 decree; explanation of many Old Testament as "purely" [though

---

to Canaan, which we could justly suppose even if the Bible's silence were absolute; but (p. 168) 1 Chr 4,21; 8,1 does not justify Moore's conclusion that parts of Juda and Benjamin were also in Palestine before "the" Exodus.

[45] Response signed by the secretary of the Biblical Commission and approved by Pope Pius XI, Feb. 27, 1934; *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 26 (1934) 130-131; *Enchiridion Biblicum*^{2} (Rome 1954) §§515-519. The author, Friedrich Schmidtke, has meanwhile continued zealously his efforts to discover and promote the truth. His book, entitled *Die Einwanderung Israels in Kanaan* (Breslau 1933) maintains on p. 64 that the Exodus was in 1220, and the *migration of Abraham from Harran* as late as 1450, a position which would not inspire confidence.

not "doing violence to the sacred text"] natural events), or are concerned with details of less far-reaching sweep (Jacob was not the son of Isaac but represents an Aramaic tribe; the patriarchal narratives in part concern tribes rather than individuals): it follows that the universality of the Isodus is thrown into an altogether massive prominence. This again is not in virtue of any formal or authoritative assertion made relative thereto, but because of the scarcely escapable implication that this constitutes one of the points on which there has been a unanimous consent of Catholic teaching, obviously inherent in the norms of Catholic interpretation and indeed in the very concept of biblical inspiration and inerrancy, in regard to which the Catholic should (even without being thus warned) know that he is not at liberty to propose a serious and careful original hypothesis aimed at solving apparent disagreements of the biblical data among themselves or with the facts of extrabiblical history.

Since the response carefully avoids saying that the non-universal Isodus *by itself,* or any other one of the objectionable doctrines when taken separately, is contrary to Catholic teaching: one might argue thus: whereas a book containing *careless* statements relative to an *unproved* hypothesis of the Isodus, mingled with other and more obviously vicious doctrines, is *as a unity* contrary to Catholic teachings, it is nevertheless not prohibited to the mature exegete to propose arguments tending to establish that a partial Isodus is not irreconcilable with universal and immutable Catholic teaching, and, in fact, tends to enhance the reverence due the sacred text by eliminating what formerly appeared to be contradictions and inconsistencies. Nonetheless it remains the "safest and easiest" course to maintain as a disciplinary if not dogmatic norm that *all* the tribes of Israel entered Egypt together under Jacob and Joseph.

It would seem that all the severe things said against a partial Isodus as obviously and *a priori* incompatible with the plainest norms of Catholic teaching are *a fortiori* true regarding a partial or double Exodus; but in default of any positive statement to this effect one may be guided by the principle *odiosa sunt restringenda,* at least to the extent of maintaining that a disciplinary rather than dogmatic issue is involved. Moreover, due attention must be paid to two more recent pronouncements of the Holy See in which is severely condemned the erroneous and imprudent view that everything which is *new* may for that reason justly be suspected.[46]

Hence, after fearlessly facing the issue, we may confidently conclude that no ecclesiastical warning or tradition impedes the Catholic exegete from advancing the arguments which seem to him to warrant the hypothesis of a double Exodus. And nevertheless we feel that he will not be apt to do so because it simply renders more complicated his duty of elucidating sensibly the Scriptural text, not only as inspired, but even as a merely but genuinely human record.

More readily may we admit, and indeed the evidence itself draws us toward this conclusion, that the chronological and geographical indications found in our present text relative to one single (Isodus and) Exodus underwent variant recensions. The famous "doublets" are freely admitted by Catholics for certain portions of I Samuel (15-21), Psalms (14 vs. 53), and Proverbs (25,1, cf. the "book of Ezechias" there cited). Whether or not one be willing to admit such "doublets" as customarily argued in defense of sources of the Pentateuch, one may independently admit that the Exodus-story was originally handed down among those who had experienced it so vividly that they had no need of chronological or geographical specifications; and when the need of these began to be felt, the sacred text was in the hands of schools of diverging politico-religious *tendency,* who made such insertions as they knew from other ancient records to be justified, and we may even say inerrant as far as they went, though not always superficially compatible with alternatively introduced and similarly inerrant qualifications introduced elsewhere.

Needless to add, it is quite possible that other and minor details were inserted by posterior scribes; and these, far from being inspired, may have been hyperbolic, anachronistic, or downright erroneous. Experience of textual criticism has taught that such a procedure, though rare and unlikely in general, is especially admissible for details of a flagrant and unawaited *precision.* The result of all this is that instead of concluding too hastily to actually alternative episodes, we should resign ourselves to re-examining patiently the textual data and awaiting new archaeological discoveries with a view to clarifying how the present apparent divergences or incompatibilities of the text may by sound hermeneutic principles be traced back to the single monumental occurrence which *the* Exodus is universally held to be in the pages of the Old Testament.

---

[46] Pope Pius XII, *Divino Afflante Spiritu, A.A.S.* 35 (1943) 319 = *Enchiridion Biblicum*^{2} §564; cf. *A.A.S.* 40 (1948) 45 = *EB*^{2} §577.

CONCLUSIONS

(1) In the present manifoldly-tentative state of our information we will unhesitatingly maintain that the most suitable date for the Exodus is in the early years of Meneptaḥ, about 1230 B.C., with Rameses II as Pharaoh of the Oppression about 1270.

(2) This position is based primarily on the long reign of Rameses and his building activities at the immense capital bearing that name in the northeast Delta. Some, though not unanswerable, corroboration is afforded by such chronological indications as can be derived from the biblical 400 years since Joseph (the Hyksos). The Meneptaḥ-stele is thus best regarded as a pharaonic boast of having "driven" the Hebrews from Egypt to a presumed demise in the desert.

(3) The arguments favoring Rameses would tend secondarily to justify the position of Albright and Couroyer placing the Oppression under Seti I before 1300 and the Exodus under Rameses II, thus allowing the Israelites time to be installed in Canaan before the Meneptaḥ-stele describes them as annihilated there.

(4) The existence of Ḫabiru, in whom we will for the present persist in seeing some branch or affiliate of the Hebrews, in Canaan about 1400 (prescinding from the more doubtful possibility of Asher or some other Tribe there), coupled with the length and splendor of the reign of Tḥutmes III of the dynasty which expelled the Hyksos (*four generations* after Joseph!), constitutes a forcible argument in favor of an Oppression under that anti-Semitic monarch (Exodus under Amen-Ḥotep II). But Tḥutmes III is not known to have carried on any operations in the Delta (certainly not building a town named Rameses), nor to have established himself in the proximity to Goshen required by the Plagues narrative.

(5) Factors favoring an Oppression under Tḥutmes III allow of sufficient time-extension to include either the *earlier* Queen

Hatshepsut (of the Sinai mines inscriptions) or the *later* Akhenaten (the weak and heirless Solar Monotheist), for motives of a rather fanciful character but not for that to be altogether discredited.

(6) The chief argument hitherto invoked in favor of an Exodus about 1400 B.C., but also diversely interpreted to favor a later date, the alleged Josue-wall of Jericho, must since the 1952 Kenyon excavations there be left absolutely out of account. The alleged Josue-wall has been proved to date from before the year 2000 B.C. The excavation has not in any similar way *positively excluded* an occupation of the site during the period 1500-1200, but neither has a wide variety of soundings revealed any evidence of it.

(7) With the default of the Jericho evidence, the problem of a similar occupation-lacuna at ‘Ay regains its full force, hitherto explained away in reliance upon Jericho; similarly the independent but less pertinent excavation-results of Debir-Mirsim and Lakiš-Duwayr must be relegated to the limbo of uncorroborated supplementary detail.

(8) The emergence of *two* dates as most prominent favored by biblical and extrabiblical evidence for the Exodus, roughly 1400 and 1250, which has been leading non-Catholic experts almost unanimously to postulate a *double* Exodus (but with every conceivable variation of date and makeup), in our opinion should be traced rather to possibly posterior recensions of minor portions of a narrative which concerned the *single* Exodus as an indispensable bed-rock datum.

Robert North, S.J.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Rome

THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN FRANCE

Upon my return from France, my native country, where I spent the summer months, I anticipate questions concerning the religious situation there. I also presume that the questions will again reflect the unlightened current opinion abroad that France, as a whole, is dechristianized. This is not exact. Actually, if we discount large and healthy groups of most fervent Christians or Catholics in all the segments of French population, we have in France people "more or less Christian," others "more or less dechristianized." Upon my personal first-hand observations, confirmed by statements from those on the scene, France remains a Christian nation, at least a Christian-minded nation. This despite the fact that great numbers in certain localities do not practice their religion. At various times, surveys of the situation were made in both rural and industrial communities, and statistics drawn up. But we cannot appraise a situation with accuracy and satisfaction on mere figures. Furthermore let us bear in mind that in the figures enter considerable elements from nearly every country in Europe. They are the uprooted ones who, as a rule, do not thrive so well spiritually on foreign soil, but who again would resume the practice of their religious duties, as soon as they return home. These foreign elements should also be taken into account in reference to Communism in France and in evaluating its strength.

In limiting myself to the bulk of French racial elements and in examining things in the light of French mentality, I would characterize the religious climate in the country as one of indifference, but indifference is not irreligion. As a matter of fact, many in France who do not attend Mass or receive the Sacraments nevertheless maintain certain practices of prayer. Occasionally we see them joining traditional pilgrimages to some well-known national sanctuaries or shrines. Again they contribute to charitable institutions, give financial aid to schools in charge of nuns or priests (*écoles libres*) and send their children to those schools. "I do not practice my religion," said an acquaintance of mine, "but I share in the support of the church, and I try to live according to Christian principles." Others I chanced to talk to gave me the same formula of daily conduct. The most amazing fact, notes a French priest of prominence annd an expert judge of the situation is that:

were you to ask some in that group of non-practicing Catholics: "Would you be ready to defend your faith, even to die for it, should exceptional circumstances demand?" The answer would most likely be: "Yes indeed!"

NO HOSTILITY IN GENERAL

Contrary to statements from those who appraise rather superficially the religious situation in France, the great majority of French people are not hostile to the clergy. Particularly in rural localities, they are most anxious to have a priest in residence. They feel that his presence is a blessing, and they value highly the moral support from him in time of distress, his kind counselling in their difficulties, and his assistance in illness. They refer to him as their "bon Curé," their good Pastor or "Padre." If for some reason or another, the parish is left without a priest for any length of time, they call on the municipal authorities, even those known to be politically left wing, to make representations to the bishop so that the vacancy may be filled. Strange, is it not? For at the same time the religious indifference or apathy of these people leaves the church more than half empty on Sundays.

I would point out in passing the serious problem that confronts many bishops in France, especially in rural areas, due to the scarcity of clergy. In some sections of the country, one priest has to take care of the spiritual needs of souls scattered in three or four villages miles apart. He is lucky if he is young enough to ride a bicycle or has the means to procure a motorcyle.

RELIGIOUS SENTIMENT STILL DEEP

Another proof that the religious sentiment has not deserted the soul of the French people is the fact that parents, with few exceptions, have their children baptized and as they grow up send them to catechism in preparation for private Holy Communion at the age of six or seven, followed four or five years later by the solemn Holy Communion with the renewal of baptismal promises. Attendance at catechism class must continue and rigidly until the Sacrament of Confirmation. As customary both solemn Holy Communion and reception of Confirmation are an occasion for a great celebration at home after the church ceremony, bringing together relatives and friends. This may have the character of a purely traditional social custom, you might say. Yet it denotes an abiding religious sentiment and the importance which parents attach to these two great events in the life of their children.

Again most weddings, after the civil ceremony in the town "mairie," are on the same day solemnized in the church with Nuptial Mass. It is also interesting and comforting to point out that the most indifferent or delinquent in the practice of religion have the priest called at the approach of death, for the Last Sacraments, and insist on being buried from the church with a Mass. It may well be the first one they have been present at in many long years.

As I discussed the matter with a French peasant—a Catholic in name only—whose life, as in the case of many others, had been almost a complete religious vacuum since the marriage ceremony, I advised him that should death come, he could not expect Christian burial. "But, Mon Révérend Père," he shouted in vehement protest the tell-tale reply: "I am still a Christian and far from me to be buried like a dog."

NO FORMAL APOSTASY

Even among the working classes in congested industrial centers with such a low moral standard that you feel in the midst of dehumanized characters, there is, according to my observations on the spot and what I have been told, a practical but no formal apostasy from faith. A priest, a classmate of mine who for a number of years worked in such localities, told me his story typical of other similar experiences. "I never or seldom noticed," said he, "any hostility on the part of those working men, even those imbued with communistic ideas, but a rather respectful and friendly attitude. I always found great pleasure in conversing with them. Moreover, whenever they became aware of my material needs, they never refused to help me out either with money or food. When they heard that the Bishop had appointed me to another parochial post, some came to me with tears in their eyes: 'Oh, Monsieur le Curé, we hate to see you leaving us. We loved you so much!' "

A priest whose parish is located in a rural section told me his own story indicative that faith is not dead among French people, and his story could be duplicated by that of other confrères. "I count about four hundred souls in my parish," he said. "Of this number nearly half never darken the door of my church on Sunday and many have no scruple whatsoever in working in the fields Sunday after Sunday. Yet they never fail to attend Mass on Christmas day, on Easter Sunday and Pentecost day. Some even send me flowers for the Feast of Corpus Christi. I also infallibly see them at Mass on the Feast of the Assumption, on All Saints Day and other major feast-days on the calendar."

The Feast of the Assumption particularly draws large crowds into the churches, as very few Frenchmen forget that the nation was consecrated to Our Lady of the Assumption by King Louis XIII. "Once a year," the priest added, "I make a round of the parish to collect the annual offerings for the support of diocesan clergy. With the exception of few, they give and with generous spirit, out of their meager savings."

Not infrequently, self-styled Communists go on pilgrimage to some shrine, and there burn candles or have Masses offered to pray for the cure of a disease afflicting a member of their family.

IS COMMUNISM STRONG?

To those who may ask if Communism is making any headway in France, I shall emphatically say: No! Many known as Communists are only so in name, having never read anything about Marxist doctrine. Strange as it may seem, it is not unusual that they even contribute, although not publicly, to the support of Church institutions. As a typical example, the head of a country parochial school said to me recently with a dash of humor: "If it were not for the help of my so-called 'reds' in the locality, I would have to close the school. Of course some *must* contribute, as they send their children to us."

As a militant group, Communists in France began to lose ground as far back as 1948. Everyone is aware of the fact that the leaders of the Communist party would have to close shop and discontinue their daily paper "L'Humanité" if it were not for the financial backing they receive from abroad. I have been informed that in many localities, Communist papers which, at the time of the liberation of France, sprang up almost overnight like mushrooms, have either ceased or reached a very low ebb in circulation. "Le Soir" in Paris had to quit altogether. As to the standard-bearer of the party, "L'Humanité," from its high-water mark of 580,000 in circulation after the war, it has dropped to 135,000. It comes far behind the Catholic daily "La Croix," as it registers only 14,000 subscribers by mail, as against 147,000 subscribers to "La Croix." And it is estimated that the red daily is edited with twenty-three per cent loss in unsold copies. It did not take French people long to learn that the injustices in the social structure could not be corrected by Communism. They are too individualistic and freedom loving to support a regime that cannot maintain itself except by constant spying or prying into personal and domestic affairs. At the close of the war, when France emerged from national peril, the masses, emotionally stirred up, were but too inclined to give a willing ear to red mountebanks with their fantastic promises. However, abject slavery for the benefit of a cynical group in power, as Communism proved to be wherever it gained control, became so evident that most Frenchmen lost interest in the lying red propaganda with its old cliché of "earthly paradise." Moreover the worldwide and most revolting cruelties of Communism did not help its diabolical cause. Only a military force with the backing of Russia could implant Communism in France, or rather impose it upon a reluctant population.

CAUSES OF THE RELIGIOUS CRISIS

In examining the religious crisis in France, the mass indifference I have described and evaluated must not be taken too lightly. As I said above, indifference is not apostasy; but it is a sure step to it.

One may ask: what brought about the decline in a nation with such a glorious Christian past? It should not be impossible to find and evaluate the factors in the French religious situation, if we realize that the conditions that prevail in France are but an aspect of a worldwide situation. Truly, all nations, and America is no exception, are affected in a greater or lesser degree by the moral deterioration caused by an ever-intensified material progress and mechanized civilization. In the case of France, however, the crisis takes on a more conspicuous character and causes a greater surprise abroad from the fact of long centuries of most flourishing Catholicism in that country.

HISTORICAL FACTORS IN THE CRISIS

Besides the debilitating materialistic atmosphere in which we live and which leads so many into practical atheism, the religious crisis in France owes its acuteness to an historical factor which many abroad seem to ignore. I refer to the systematic and all-out opposition on the part of those in power to the influence of the Church and all its activities in the country. The opposition pursued its sinister course with short-lived easing-off periods for nearly a century. It degenerated into a violent persecution against the Church and Church institutions in 1900. (On this I am in a position to give first hand information, as I was then in France pursuing my college studies). By government decrees all Catholic schools were closed and those in charge—priests, nuns, brothers—forced into exile abroad. It was the tragic climax of the famous "lois laiques" which in 1882 established in France's public schools the official anti-Christian teaching. It is such teaching, influencing the minds of youths deprived of private schools where religion was taught, that gradually led masses into religious indifference. For a number of years, up to the First World War, indifference was coupled with hostility or "bitter anti-clericalism." The hostility, as we know, abated considerably during the tragic events of 1914-1919, as the national peril called for national unity. "L'union sacrée," the sacred union of all citizens, became the national slogan. It was not long before the hostility completely ceased, but religious indifference is still in France. Officially, however, from some in power and down the line of their disciples, there is again a more or less concealed upsurge of opposition to Church infiuence and work among the youth of the nation. This became quite evident recently at a national congress of public school teachers, with the blessings of some government officials behind the scenes. The meetings as commented upon by the Catholic press, displayed a marked anti-clerical character. It almost looked like the launching of a new crusade against the Church.

CATHOLIC ELITE IN FRANCE

Serious as it may be, the crisis in France is not without hopeful and definite signs for a solution that would crown the valiant efforts of those who, assisting a zealous and self-sacrificing clergy, work steadfastly toward a religious rewakening. Indeed, we should not ignore that there is in France, an intelligent, alert, and most militant Catholic elite from all classes of society, and all professions, engaged in divers forms of Apostolate to stir up the masses from their indifference. In that elite, over ten million strong, we find Catholic men and women who seem to be living saints. It was my good fortune to contact some of them and I was very much impressed by their solid piety and apostolic zeal. The way they bring the spirit of the Gospel into their daily life in an adverse atmosphere saturated with materialism borders on heroism. Their deep interior life of union with God is known to Him alone. The practices of ascetism they carry on, as they even deprive themselves of what we would consider most normal and innocent, could well be admired by our most rigid contemplatives. Verily it is a unique elite which I doubt has an equal anywhere else.

In this France again reveals her true national self and the characteristic traits that mark her whole history with amazing contrasts and alternatives of moral decline and glorious resurrection. So, what some pessimists, particularly abroad, call the "last hour" for the "eldest daughter of the Church," may be, as I firmly believe with many others, "the first hour of a new and bright day."

HENRI BLANC

St. Genevieve-of-the-Pines
Asheville, North Carolina

CO-OPERATION OF CATHOLICS IN NON-CATHOLIC RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

PART II

In a previous article I discussed the nature and the various types of co-operation and the application of the moral principles of co-operation to some of the problems encountered by Catholics in the matter of collaboration toward non-Catholic religious activities, particularly the building of churches and the contributing of funds toward this objective.[1] In the present article I shall attempt to apply the principles of co-operation to the question of the collaboration of Catholics in the religious rites of non-Catholics.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The Code of Canon Law clearly states the Church's rulings regarding the actual participation of Catholics in public or official non-Catholic religious rites. Active participation, such as the reception of the sacraments, singing or praying as a part of the service, etc., is entirely forbidden; passive participation, which is mere presence without any active part, can be tolerated for a grave reason, provided there is no danger of scandal and perversion. Passive participation can be justified particularly in the case of funerals and weddings.[2]

However, co-operation in a religious service does not necessarily include presence or participation. Thus, one who urges a person to take an active part in a non-Catholic religious function is a formal co-operator, and one who provides the vestments or the book of prayers is a material co-operator, though neither may attend the service. Co-operation, therefore, is wider than *communicatio in sacris.*

It is important that Catholics in our land be familiar with the general principles relating to co-operation in non-Catholic religious rites, and especially with the reasons on which they are based. For problems in this matter frequently arise and our people need guidance and direction as to the manner in which they must solve these problems consistently with their Catholic faith. They are too prone to seek a solution in concrete terms rather than on the basis of a principle. Thus, a Catholic hears from another Catholic that this latter was told by a priest that he might attend a wedding in a Protestant church. The first individual concludes that a Catholic may always attend a wedding in a Protestant church. Of course, this conclusion is far too wide. Such attendance (even though passive) demands a grave reason—a condition that was doubtless fulfilled in the case of his friend, but may not be present in his own case to justify his presence at a particular wedding he wishes to attend. If he were familiar with the principle involved, he would not be so likely to make an erroneous decision.

---

[1] CF. *AER,* CXXXIV, 2 (Feb. 1956), 98-108.

[2] Can. 1258.

Catholics should realize particularly that in proposing legislation regarding co-operation in non-Catholic religious activities, the Church is not laying down merely ecclesiastical law. It is the law of God that is at stake. For our Divine Saviour established only one Church entitled to perform and to authorize acts of public worship, particularly the Holy Sacrifice and the sacraments. It is only when these sacred ceremonies are conducted with the authorization of the one true Church that they are objectively lawful and conformable to the will of God. Even when a non-Catholic religious function contains nothing that is false, it is not a licit act of worship because it lacks the approbation of Christ's Church. For this reason, a Catholic does not satisfy his obligation of Sunday Mass if he is present at a Liturgy celebrated in a schismatic rite, even though a true eucharistic sacrifice is offered.[3]

Sometimes, it is true, a Catholic is permitted to receive the ministrations of a non-Catholic priest. For example, a Catholic in danger of death is allowed to receive the sacrament of Penance from a schismatic priest.[4] However, this is not an exception to the principle just enunciated. For in such a case the schismatic priest is approved by the Church to administer the sacrament, and receives the same jurisdiction that the Church confers in such circumstances on Catholic priests.

---

[3] Cf. Can. 1249. Bancroft, *Communication in Religious Worship with non-Catholics* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1943), p. 116.

[4] Cf. Szal, *The Communication of Catholics with Schismatics* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948), p. 93.

It is especially necessary that our Catholic people should be aware of the principles governing religious communication and co-operation nowadays because of the strong tendency outside the Church to "bury differences," and there are many well-intentioned non-Catholics who believe that a mutual participation and collaboration in the religious rites of different groups is one of the most effective means to amity and brotherhood. Beyond doubt, there is often genuine good will on the part of many who hold this view, which may render it more difficult for a Catholic to maintain his stand without compromise than if he were being attacked in a spirit of hostility. Thus, a Catholic is a week-end guest of a Protestant friend. On Sunday morning his host may attend Mass with him as a mark of friendship. But when he himself is visiting the Catholic, he may expect this latter to accompany him to the Protestant church, and may even be offended if this mark of courtesy (as he regards it) is refused. A Catholic placed in such a situation should not be content with the bare statement: "My Church forbids me to attend non-Catholic services," but should be able to explain the reasonable and logical basis of this prohibition by the Catholic Church. In a word, our Catholic laity should have an *intelligent* grasp of the Church's teaching on co-operation and *communicatio in sacris.*

As was stated in the previous article, co-operation in another's action can be either physical or moral. Under these two headings we shall consider some of the more frequent occasions presented to Catholics in our land of co-operation in non-Catholic religious activities.

PHYSICAL CO-OPERATION

By physical co-operation we mean collaboration consisting essentially in some physical act, such as providing articles to be used in a non-Catholic religious service, allowing such a service to be held in a place under one's jurisdiction, etc. Participation in a service would be a form of physical co-operation—active participation being formal co-operation, passive participation ordinarily being material co-operation. The general rule is that formal co-operation is never allowed, material co-operation is *per se* forbidden, but for a sufficiently grave reason can *per accidens* become licit.[5]

---

[5] Cf. Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia moralis* (Turin, 1950), I, n. 399.

To provide articles for use in non-Catholic religious services, such as sacramental bread and wide, sacred vessels, candles, etc., is in itself material co-operation—though it would become formal co-operation *ex parte finis operantis* if the one performing the action explicitly directed it toward the promotion of unauthorized or false religious worship. The more important an article is toward the conducting of non-Catholic worship, the graver reason must a Catholic have to justify him in consigning it to the church or the clergyman. Thus, a more serious reason would be needed to allow a Catholic to sell vestments for a non-Catholic service than to sell flowers. Moreover, the measure of authority a person possesses over an object would vary the problem. The express man who is told to deliver a box of candles to be used in the Protestant church can regard the fact that this is his assigned job a sufficient justification for this act of material co-operation; whereas the owner of the candles needs a much greater reason to sell or donate them to the church for use in religious ceremonies.

In determining the lawfulness of this type of material co-operation we must make an important distinction between tradespeople and private individuals. The former generally are morally justified in selling whatever goods they have on display to anyone who requests them, whatever his creed or church. It would impose considerable hardship on a salesman if he had to ask the religious belief of every customer. Moreover, in some places a manifestation of discrimination on religious grounds might result in the loss of the storekeeper's license.[6] But it is different with private individuals. Apart from most extraordinary instances they would not be justified in providing articles that proximately serve for use in non-Catholic worship, such as altar-vessels, wine, vestments, etc. Thus, a community of nuns could not contract to make a set of vestments for a Protestant church, even though they are greatly in need of financial resources. I believe that a like judgment would have to be passed in the case of the Oriental schismatic church, even though their Liturgy is a true eucharistic sacrifice.

---

[6] It is not true, however, that a storekeeper will always be liable to the loss of his license if he refuses to deal with a certain customer. Hence, a Catholic tradesman should refuse to make or sell a chalice for non-Catholic religious functions unless he has a very grave reason to justify him. The mere fact that he will derive considerable profit from the transaction is not a sufficient reason.

I have heard of instances in which a Protestant clergyman requested a priest to lend or give him some altar-breads for his religious services. In such a case, the only answer must be a courteous but firm refusal, even though the result will be a definite severence of friendly relations. As I stated in a previous issue of this periodical: "The co-operation toward an objectively sinful religious service would be so proximate on the part of a priest who would furnish the Protestant minister with altar breads specially prepared for communion that it is difficult to see how there could be a sufficiently grave reason to justify it."[7]

A somewhat different case occurred, I have been told, in our armed forces in the East in recent years. The army furnished large quantities of altar-breads for all chaplains, and sometimes one of the Catholic chaplains was assigned to distribute them. In such a case, he need have no qualms of conscience in providing non-Catholic chaplains with their share, for since the altar-breads were the property of the army, intended for Protestants as well as Catholics, all had the same right to them. However, it is certainly more desirable that Catholic chaplains provide themselves with altar-breads intended only for use in Catholic services.

In a hospital the utensils employed in sick-calls that are of a definitely religious character—such as the candles, the crucifix, the holy water sprinkler—should be reserved for use by the Catholic priest. If a public hospital provides such articles, but in such wise that all clergymen are free to use them, the priest should purchase a set for his own use. On the other hand, there would be no objection to the common use of a table, spoons, drinking-glasses, etc., which the priest utilizes on a communion-call. In a Catholic hospital the Protestant clergyman should be permitted to have a place for whatever articles he wishes to use on his sick-calls. Moreover, in a Catholic hospital it is permissible for the authorities to allow the use of a room for the circumcision of Jewish children.[8]

---

[7] *AER,* CXI, 1 (July 1944). A somewhat easier judgment could be passed on the Catholic baker from whom a non-Catholic clergyman orders bread, even though the baker suspects that it will be used for sacramental purposes. For bread baked in a loaf is not specifically adapted to liturgical use.

[8] Cf. *AER,* CX, 3 (March 1944), 223.

The question was once presented to me whether a pastor could allow the local Protestant congregation the use of his hall for their services on Sunday, when their church had been destroyed by fire. The problem is indeed a difficult one, and there may be theologians who would answer in the affirmative. But, while admiring the sincerity and good will of the Protestants who wish to keep up their religious functions in this difficult situation, I answered that the co-operation in this case was too proximate to justify the granting of the permission, even though misunderstanding and hard feeling would very likely follow. For, the opening of the Catholic hall to Protestant worship would surely tend to give the impression that differences of belief are an affair of little consequence.

MORAL CO-OPERATION

Co-operation is not limited to physical activity in or toward another's action. Co-operation may consist in moral concurrence—for example, advice, counselling, urging, which will induce or help another to act. If such advice or counselling or inducement is directed to the performance of an action that is intrinsically wrong, it ordinarily constitutes formal co-operation in the evil act, and consequently is intrinsically wrong and partakes of the nature and gravity of the evil act to which it is directed. I say that *ordinarily* such co-operation is intrinsically wrong, because theologians commonly admit a principle that has an important bearing on the particular problem we are considering—the principle that when a person is definitely determined to commit a sin and can be deterred from performing the evil deed only by inducing him to commit a sin of lesser gravity, it is morally justifiable to persuade him to commit this lesser sin. An example is the man who is determined to kill his wife, but who can be deterred from this base deed only by persuading him to get drunk and thus to forget his troubles. In such a case, according to the teaching of reliable theologians, it is permissible to induce the individual in question to drink to excess.[9]

However, the primary principle to be emphasized is that it is ordinarily sinful to persuade a person to commit a sin, even though he himself is not aware of the sinfulness of the act—namely, even though it is only a material sin. As it is expressed by Merkelbach:

---

[9] Cf. Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia moralis* (Turin, 1950), I, n. 379.

"It is not lawful to invite others to the services or sermons of heretics, either by persuasion or by authority or by any other type of invitation, because this is to induce them directly to commit sin, which is intrinsically wrong."[10]

The problem most frequently adduced in this connection is that of the Catholic nurse who is requested by the non-Catholic patient to summon a clergyman of his own creed to confer on him some sacramental rite. A decision of the Holy Office, given on March 15, 1848, declared that the nurse (actually, the question was concerned with a nursing sister) could not licitly fulfil the request.[11] The question seems to have visualized an explicit request on the part of the nurse that the minister perform some spiritual ministration. This would be formal co-operation toward unauthorized cult, and consequently would be forbidden. In practice, however, at least as far as this country is concerned, the solution of the problem seems very simple. The nurse can simply transmit to the clergyman the request that he come and visit the patient, without making reference to any rites or ceremonies he may wish to perform. Surely, no minister should demand more than this information, which is all that a priest would expect in the case of a Catholic patient. And, when the nurse confines herself to this simple request, she is free from any formal co-operation in non-Catholic rites, and can have the assurance that her material co-operation is sufficiently justified by the fact that a hospital that opens its doors to persons of all creeds is expected to show to all patients the courtesy of inviting a clergyman of whatever denomination they may choose to come and visit them.[12]

When we study the problem of moral co-operation toward non-Catholic services on a broader scale, we must begin with an important distinction—the distinction between merely conveying to others the information that such a service is to be held, and recommending or advising the conducting of non-Catholic worship or active participation in it. It is only this latter that constitutes formal co-operation. Merely to announce, in word or in writing, that a non-Catholic ceremony is to take place in a certain church at a certain hour is material co-operation, which can be justified for a sufficient reason.

---

[10] Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis* (Paris, 1938), I, n. 763.

[11] Cf. Fanfani, *Manuale theologiae moralis* (Rome, 1950), II, n. 42.

[12] Cf. Genicot, *Institutiones theologiae moralis* (Brussels, 1946), I, n. 20.

Let us illustrate by some concrete cases. A Catholic manager in a large hotel may be asked by a guest about the hour of Sunday services in the neighboring Protestant church. He would be permitted to inquire about the matter and convey the information to the guest. Similarly, the Catholic editor of a newspaper could print the schedule of services in the various non-Catholic houses of worship. It is well to note that in giving out information of this kind (an act of material co-operation) the Catholic is not justified merely because of any temporal benefits he may thereby gain. There can and should be a sincere regard for the sincerity and good will of those who are striving to worship God according to their conscience; and though this will not justify formal co-operation, it can at times serve as a potent reason for material co-operation. Indeed, this point was explicitly mentioned by Pope Pius XII in his discourse *Ci riesce,* of Dec. 6, 1953, in which he adduced as one of the reasons why the Church is lenient toward those who profess non-Catholic creeds "regard for those who in good conscience (though erroneous but invincibly so) are of different opinion."[13] Hence, we can say that the earnest desire of non-Catholic inquirers to worship in accord with their conscience can provide the hotel manager and the editor described above with a sufficient reason to perform the act of material co-operation entailed in giving information as to the place and time of non-Catholic worship.

However, the case is different when there is question of urging or advising non-Catholics to take part in worship that a Catholic logically regards as contrary to the will of God. The well-instructed Catholic will see the fallacy and the indifferentism contained in the phrase, so commonly circulated today, that "everyone should be encouraged to worship God in the form of religion he prefers." To follow this principle in such a manner that one would urge Protestants, Jews, Mohammedans, etc., to practice their respective religious rites would be formal co-operation in false and unauthorized worship of a most extreme type, a deplorable disregard of the fact that the Son of God established and authorized only one Church entitled to render true public worship to the Creator.

---

[13] Cf. *AER,* CXXX, 2 (Feb. 1954), 137.

Hence, the Catholic delivering a radio talk on the need of religion in present-day life should not advise all his hearers to "go regularly to their respective churches to participate in the services," although he may urge them to pray, since prayer is a private act of religious cult which is a good deed, no matter what may be the creed of the one who prays, as long as it contains no erroneous doctrine. (Indeed, Catholics may pray privately with non-Catholics, as long as the prayer contains nothing false.)

Neither may Catholics participate in campaigns with the slogan "worship in the church of your choice," a movement that is becoming rather common in America nowadays. In such participation, it would seem, there is not only formal co-operation but also a very pronounced factor of indifferentism.

It may be asked whether the principle proposed above, that one may sometimes suggest to another the performance of a lesser evil if this is the only way in which he can be deterred from a greater evil, can be applied to this question of co-operation. In the present problem the greater evil is the entire neglect of religious interests and activities, the lesser evil is participation in a form of worship that is unauthorized, and usually false to some extent, but yet contains elements of truth and goodness and furnishes some inspiring motives to virtuous conduct. I believe that this principle can be utilized in certain specific instances. Thus, about ten years ago, I wrote as follows in respect to two possible applications of this principle in the matter of recommending attendance at non-Catholic religious instruction and worship:

> Catholics believe that Catholicism alone is true and all other religions are false, and hence they regard it as *per se* sinful to urge anyone to participate actively in non-Catholic religious services or to attend non-Catholic religious instruction. We say that *per se* this is sinful, for there is a moral principle that might justify such conduct in certain circumstances. It is the principle, admitted by many good theologians, that when a person is going to do something wrong, another may lawfully urge him to do something less sinful, if this is the only way of deterring him from the greater evil. Now, it might be argued that at the present day the majority of non-Catholic children in our great cities will be brought up in entire ignorance of religion and morality if they are not given instruction in the released-time program, and that it would be a lesser evil to have them receive non-Catholic instruction (which contains much that is true and good, even

though it contains error) than if they were brought up utterly devoid of religion. If conditions are such in a city that the released-time program will not be introduced unless Catholics are willing to urge non-Catholics to attend non-Catholic instructions, this principle might be applied. But in these circumstances Catholic lay workers should be properly instructed, lest they become imbued with indifferentistic ideas. Similarly, Catholic chaplains might use this principle at times to allow them to urge non-Catholic soldiers and sailors to attend their own services. If it can be reasonably judged that the men will derive some religious ideals from these services and will be induced to lead better lives, whereas they would exclude God from their lives entirely if they did not attend, a Catholic chaplain might be justified in urging such attendance as the lesser of two evils.[14]

But to apply this principle in a general way to justify the indiscriminate urging of non-Catholics to take part in their particular church services is utterly unjustifiable. For there are many non-Catholics who have a considerable amount of religious practice in their private and domestic lives, and it surely cannot be said of these persons that if they do not attend their church services their lives will be entirely irreligious and godless. However, it is only on this last supposition that the principle of the recommendation of the lesser of two evils can be utilized.

CONCLUSION

Priests must expect resentment and bewilderment on the part of some hearers if they proclaim as they should the principles of Catholic theology concerning the co-operation of Catholics toward the religious worship of non-Catholics. For, beyond doubt, the attitude that all religions are good and should be favored, that we must forget our differences, etc., has been accepted by many Catholics. It is a very comfortable attitude as far as this world is concerned, winning for Catholics from their non-Catholic neighbors the encomium that they are really very broad-minded persons, much less bigoted than the Catholics of past generations. But such praise is a poor compensation for the spiritual loss entailed by the compromise of a fundamental Catholic principle, the principle that all forms of public worship devoid of the approval of the Catholic Church are opposed to the will of God. It is the duty of priests to provide their people with proper instruction and inspiration on this important matter. We must try to develop intelligent lay Catholics, who will fully realize that, while Christian charity must be manifested to all men, the beliefs and worship of those who are separated from the Catholic Church are not in harmony with the divine plan for human salvation.

---

[14] *AER,* CXIII, 6 (June 1945), 474.

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Fifty Years Ago

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for March, 1906, is a commentary, by Fr. V. McNabb, O.P., on the term "Logos" as used by St. John in his Gospel. The author sees in this term an appeal to the Greek mind. St. John consistently used the term "Son" throughout his Gospel in reference to Christ; but, Father McNabb believes, the Evangelist later added the first eighteen verses, as a preface, for the benefit of Greek readers familiar with Platonic philosophy, to point out that the Son can be called the Word. . . . Father Heuser, the editor, contributes an article on "Catholicizing the United States." He believes that in our discussion with non-Catholics there should be less polemics and more positive exposition of truth. He states that Catholics should not inveigh against the text of the Bible as used by Protestants, since the new Revised Version is very similar to the Catholic text. . . . Fr. E. Devine, S.J., presents another instalment of his novel "The Training of Silas." . . . The famous English convert, Fr. Robert Hugh Benson, writes on "The Conversion of England." He classifies under three headings the means of spreading the faith—prayer, example, and controversy. He recommends great courtesy and kindness in the use of this last procedure. He points out that to the Anglican clergyman who claims that the proof of the validity of his ordination is found in his consciousness of abundant grace through his communions we can reply that because of his good faith God doubtless gave him many graces directly on the occasion of his communions, but this is no proof of the validity of his priesthood. . . . Dr. James A. Walsh concludes his series of historical articles on the celebrated Danish scientist and convert to the faith in the seventeenth century, Bishop Stensen. . . . In the Studies and Analecta we find the regulations issued by Pope Pius X concerning the sojourn of foreign priests in Rome. Apparently, many of the clergy were spending too long a time in the Eternal City without proper authorization. . . .

F. J. C.

Answers to Questions

SUBSTITUTION OF AN INNOCENT VICTIM FOR A CONDEMNED PERSON

Question: Is it lawful for an innocent person to substitute himself for one who has been sentenced to death for a serious crime?

Answer: The questioner apparently refers to the case of an innocent person who is able to substitute himself for one who is condemned to death, in such wise that the prison authorities and the executioners will be unaware of the substitution and will put the willing victim to death in the belief that he is the person who was sentenced to die.

A distinction is called for before this question can be answered—namely, whether the person condemned to death was justly or unjustly convicted of a crime meriting the supreme penalty. In the event that the conviction was unjust—for example, in the case of a priest sentenced to death by a Communist government on charges trumped up because the enemies of religion wish to stamp out the faith—it would seem that another person, in a spirit of Christian charity, could substitute himself in the manner described. Thus, a lay Catholic might secretly take the place of the priest and sacrifice his life in order that this latter may be enabled to continue his labors for the welfare of souls. This solution is an application of the principle of the double effect. The one who performs this generous deed is *doing* nothing wrong. He is simply taking another's place in a prison cell, and *allowing* the authorities to put him to death. This is indeed an evil effect of the substitution, but it is no more unjust than the execution of the convicted person would be; and the sufficient reason for allowing this effect is found in the spiritual benefits that will come to many if the priest's life is preserved. The case seems analagous to the case, proposed by St. Alphonsus, of the man who voluntarily presents himself to receive the lethal blow of an unjust aggressor in order to save the life of a friend (*Theologia moralis,* Lib. III, n. 366).

The case is not so easy, however, if the prisoner has been justly sentenced to death. In that event there would be a substitution, not only of one person for another, but also of an (objectively) unjust taking of life for a just execution. Certainly, merely personal friendship would not be a justifying cause, especially if there were no assurance that the person thus given a new lease of life would amend his ways. However, since it is the common teaching of theologians that even one who is justly sentenced to death may licitly attempt to escape (Cf. Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis* [Paris, 1938], II, n. 642), it would seem that another would be allowed to help him escape by substitution and permit his own death to take place, provided some very great benefit could thus be secured. The benefit could be the common good (for example, if the convicted person were one who could do much for his country) or even the great spiritual good of the culprit (for example, the case of a criminal who is greatly repentent and desires a span of years in order to make up for his sins).

THE PUBLICATION OF THE COLLECTION

Question: In a certain parish the pastor requires his parishioners to give their contributions each Sunday in envelopes with their names, and then at the end of each month publishes a list of the contributions, for public distribution. One of the parishioners wishes to know if he is obliged to follow this procedure, whereby all the parishioners are told just how much he gives. Is he permitted to give his contributions with the stipulation that they be not made public?

Answer: It is an ecclesiastical law, based on divine law, that the faithful shall contribute to the temporal needs of the Church and of its ministers. The method whereby the funds are collected is left to local statutes and customs (Can. 1502). In many parishes of our land it is the custom for the names of those who contribute and the amounts contributed by each to be published and thus made known publicly. If the parishioners are willing to contribute under these conditions, they are permitted to do so. But if a parishioner wishes his contribution to remain a private matter, he has the right to this privacy. He has no obligation to make his particular contribution a matter of public knowledge. If he gives to the Church according to his means, he is fulfilling his duty. Hence, if he contributes in such a way that the public will not know how much he has contributed, but in such wise that he has truly given according to his means, he has fulfilled his obligations. The pastor has no right to make his contribution public, if he objects to this procedure. It is a well known fact that the publication of the contributions of the parishioners helps to swell the collection. But we must not forget that in following this procedure we should try not to foster the vanity of those who contribute generously because they wish to see their names at the head of the list or to cause painful embarrassment to those who are making sacrifices to give to the Church as much as they can afford, even though it may appear a small offering. Hence, the parishioner whom the questioner describes would seem to be acting within his rights, in objecting that the amount of his contribution be made public, as long as he is truly determined to contribute to the Church according to his financial abilities.

THE QUANTITY OF WINE FOR MASS

Question: A priest would like these two problems discussed: (1) What is the minimum quantity of wine that should be taken for the Holy Sacrifice? (2) May a priest use water only, and no wine, for both ablutions? The recent changes in the law of the eucharistic fast, prescribing that water alone may be used for both ablutions in the first Mass of the priest who binates, might seem to suggest an affirmative answer.

Answer: (1) In limiting the quantity of wine for consecration in the Mass the priest must be on his guard against two possibilities—first, the amount of wine he takes at the Offertory may be so small that it will be rendered invalid matter for the eucharistic sacrifice by the water that is added; second, it may not be sufficient to provide a *potus* of the consecrated species. This latter statement has reference to the necessity of having a sufficiently large amount of the consecrated species of wine to reach the stomach, without being substantially disintegrated through mixture with the saliva. For Our Lord commanded that we *eat and drink*

His flesh and blood, and, consequently, many theologians teach that the consecrated species must be actually transmitted to the stomach before a person can be said to have received Holy Communion. Such is the doctrine of Aertnys-Damen, who say with reference to Holy Communion under the species of bread: "If the sacred species are dissolved in the mouth . . . no grace is received, because there is lacking the *eating*" (*Theologia moralis* [Turin, 1939], II, n. 103). The same conclusion could be drawn if there were lacking the *drinking* of the consecrated species of wine. In order to guard against these possibilities it would seem that a priest should take at least two teaspoonfuls of wine for the consecration.

(2) Apart from the case of the priest who is to say another Mass or other Masses the same day, the rubrics prescribe that wine as well as water is to be used for the ablutions, and the new rubrics have not modified this prescription. Cappello believes that it is probable that the rubric requiring wine is not prescriptive, so that a priest who would use only water for the ablutions would commit no sin (*De sacramentis* [Rome, 1945], I, n. 766). However, this is contrary to the general principle that the rubrics relating to the actual celebration of Mass are binding under sin; hence, the common teaching of theologians is that there is a real obligation *per se* to use wine for the ablutions, though this obligation binds only *sub levi* (Cf. Aertnys-Damen, *op. cit.*, n. 258). *Per accidens,* therefore, for a sufficiently grave reason a priest would be allowed to use only water for both ablutions. St. Alphonsus believes, for instance, that such an exception would be found in the case of a priest who finds great difficulty in drinking wine (*abstemius*).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

ORATIO IMPERATA AND THE NEW REGULATIONS

Question: We at our parish are confused about the *oratio imperata* at Mass since the new regulations became effective on Jan. 1, 1956. Please clear up our difficulties.

Answer: Since a number of inquiries on this problem have come to our attention we shall answer it at length.

Section four of Title five of the decree effective Jan. 1, 1956, states the following: "The collects *simpliciter imperatae* by the Ordinary are omitted according to the rubrics hitherto in force, and also on all Sundays and whenever the Mass is sung; finally when the collects to be said according to the rubrics reach the number of three (including the *imperatae*)."

We must note that the decree mentions only the *oratio imperata simpliciter*. As a result this *oratio imperata simpliciter* will be omitted:

(a) on all Sundays;
(b) in all sung or solemn Masses;
(c) on doubles of the first and second class;
(d) on the vigils of Christmas and Pentecost;
(e) on Ash Wednesday, on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week;
(f) within the octaves of Christmas, Easter and Pentecost;
(g) whenever three collects have been said in Mass (*oratio* plus two commemorations); this latter an answer to a special *dubium* submitted to the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

As for the *oratio imperata* either *pro re gravi* or *pro re gravi etiam in duplicibus I classis,* the opinions are varied. Some rubricists hold for the rule that there are *never* more than three orations. If such be the rule then the question arises, why is the *oratio imperata simpliciter* alone mentioned in the decree?

Father Danagher makes this observation: "The rules for the *oratio imperata pro re gravi,* and for that which is ordered *etiam in duplicibus primae classis,* have not been changed. The former classification is omitted from the Mass only on doubles of the first class, on the vigils of Christmas and Pentecost, and on the day before Palm Sunday. If prescribed even for doubles of the first class, the prayer is omitted only on eleven of the greater feasts of the year, which are commonly listed in the Ordo and by liturgists."

May we also quote Father Moise Roy, S.S.S.: "It is clear that one must omit the commemorations prescribed *simpliciter* or one of them (the last one if two have been prescribed), when one has already recited three commemorations. However this rule does not apply to the commemorations *pro re gravi,* which are to be recited even though three commemorations have already been said."

Personally we are inclined to go along with the thinking of Father Danagher and Father Roy. If the Sacred Congregation intended the rules changed for the two last mentioned types of *oratio imperata* it would seem that specific regulations would have been set down. May we hope that the Sacred Congregation will clear up this *dubium* which has perplexed many of the priests in our country.

NEWLY ORDAINED INDULGENCE

Question: Is there an indulgence for kissing the hands of a newly ordained priest? There has been considerable discussion about this and we would appreciate your clearing up of this problem for us.

Answer: The *Enchiridion Indulgentiarum* tells us that an indulgence of one hundred days is granted to those who devoutly kiss the palms of a priest on the day of his ordination and on the day of his First Mass.

ORDINARY'S ANNIVERSARY PRAYER

Question: On the anniversary of the Ordinary's consecration which we commemorate at Holy Mass as well as the priest's own ordination anniversary, do we say these prayers if they happen to be the fourth prayer? In other words do we recite this oration even though three other prayers have been previously said?

Answer: The oration for the Ordinary on the occasion of his consecration anniversary as well as the oration for a priest on the occasion of his priestly ordination will take precedence over the *oratio imperata.* However, if there are already three orations prescribed for that particular day, then this additional prayer drops out. The general rule states that when this prayer is impeded, either permanently or accidentally, it may be said on the first free day or on the next day that is not so impeded.

SUNG MASS

Question: My Ordo for Sunday last stated at the Mass directions that the commemoration was only made at a *Missa lecta*. Does this imply that there is no commemoration at a sung Mass?

Answer: The new decree effective Jan. 1, 1956, states that at a sung Mass on Sunday (provided it is the Mass of the Sunday) there is no commemoration. However, if there is an *oratio imperata pro re gravi* or *pro re gravi etiam in duplicibus primae classis,* ordered by the Bishop Ordinary this would have to be added even at a sung Mass. If the sung Mass on Sunday is that of a first or second class feast, then the commemoration of the Sunday is made. The last gospel, however, will be of St. John and not of the current Sunday.

TENEBRAE SERVICES

Question: At our parish we have been accustomed to having Tenebrae services in English on Good Friday night. Do these new regulations concerning Holy Week rule this out?

Answer: The new Holy Week Ordo eliminates the Tenebrae services. It is permitted only once and that at the Cathedral church on Wednesday evening. It is difficult to see how it can be reckoned as an extra-liturgical service when it has been expressly eliminated.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Analecta

The Holy Father addressed several hundred Catholic physicians from Italy and European countries on the subject of psycho-prophylactic childbirth. The occasion was an audience granted on January 8. His Holiness described the theory behind this medical approach to childbirth which was first propounded by Dr. Ivan Pavlov, a Russian psychologist and physiologist and later perfected by Dr. Read, a London obstetrician. Childbirth was not always painful is the principle of the advocates of this method and it only became painful as a result of conditioned reflexes of the mother. It is, therefore, necessary to prepare the mother through prenatal instruction and exercises to bring the childbirth to termination in a natural manner. Pointing to this principle and aim of the proponents of this school, the Holy Father stated that there was no criticism of the teaching from the moral point of view. Nor, he continued, is there anything in these ideas which is contrary to Genesis (3:16) wherein it is stated that "in pain shall you bring forth children." Almighty God, said the Pope, in punishing Eve, did not forbid "mothers to make use of means which render childbirth easier and less painful." The Pope stated that a mother is free to accept this technique without any scruple of conscience if it will spare her suffering, but she is not obliged to do so. Moreover, he observed, the successful elimination of pain and fear will frequently diminish an inducement to commit immoral acts in the use of marriage rights.

In this address to the physicians the Pope made no mention of the use of hypnotism or narcotics in connection with deliveries. He noted, however, that the findings of this new method of childbirth are often presented in a materialistic context. Such contexts do not detract from the intrinsic value of the procedure for he pointed out that a convinced Christian can accept a scientific truth and at the same time prescind from any materialistic interpretation placed upon it. This is entirely possible for, as he said, the ideology of a researcher is no proof of the truth and value of what he has discovered.

Anyone who has followed the Roman press releases in recent months cannot have failed to notice the frequency of audiences and addresses by the Holy Father. One would hopefully conclude from such activities that the Holy Father's convalescence has been complete, or, at least, very good. In this connection, the recent visit of Cardinal Spellman to the Holy Father at the close of his tour of military bases was an occasion for words of reassurance from the Cardinal. He stated that he found the Holy Father in excellent health and completely recovered from his recent illness.

A new prefect of the Vatican secret archives, Monsignor Giusti, has been appointed by the Pope. Monsignor Hobert, a native of Germany, has been appointed vice-prefect.

Pope Innocent XI (1676-1689) has been honored with the title *Venerable* in a decree promulgated by the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

On January 6, the Order of the Golden Spur, one of the highest of papal honors, was awarded to Chancellor Adenauer of Germany on his eightieth birthday.

Previous Popes have spoken on various occasions about Church music and its importance for the liturgy and the apostolate. Not until December 25, 1955, however, has there been an encyclical devoted exclusively to that subject. In this encyclical, *Musicae sacrae disciplina,* His Holiness states that he wishes to answer several questions regarding Church music and to give an orderly explanation of it as well. His purpose is to help the noble art of sacred music to contribute more to the liturgy and the spiritual life of the faithful. In the first place, however, the Pope states that he wishes to confirm the norms for sacred music which have been established by Pope St. Pius X in his *Motu proprio* of 1903.

After a brief introduction, the Holy Father reviews the history of sacred music and points to the interest and solicitude of the Church in such music from the earliest days. He then develops reasons for the Church's interest in sacred music. Sacred music is closely associated with worship and for this reason can play a vital part in the apostolate. It must, however, conform to the rules of any religious art. Religious art has no place in life unless it serves to turn the minds of the faithful to God. This, therefore, is the goal of sacred music.

In connection with the idea of sacred music which is strictly liturgical, the Pope stresses the importance of other religious music such as popular religious hymns. He exhorts experienced persons in the dioceses of the world to collect such hymns where this has not already been done. These hymns must conform to Christian teachings, have easy words, a simple tune, and be marked by religious dignity and gravity. Like Gregorian chant, which the Church would ever have associated with the Latin words of the Sacred Liturgy, these popular religious hymns should have qualities of holiness, propriety of form, and universality. Hymns that measure up to such standards can be great aids in the fields of popular devotion and religious instruction.

In pointing to the supreme position of Gregorian chant in liturgical music, the encyclical also calls attention to the antiquity and beauty of liturgical chants used by various Eastern Rites. Regarding these chants, the Pope voices the hope that they will be collected and made available for the entire Church.

The encyclical also notes that polyphonic music can be a powerful means to lead souls to God. It must, however, follow liturgical laws which prohibit the bombastic in music, or the drowning out of the words of the Liturgy.

Even musical instruments other than the organ may have a place in the Liturgy. Thus the encyclical states that although the organ is the most suitable instrument, the violin and other stringed instruments may be used alone or with the organ.

As practical norms for the development of sacred music the encyclical suggests that a *schola cantorum* be organized in every cathedral and principal church. Likewise, seminars for instructions in Gregorian chant should be conducted.

In conclusion, the Pope imparts his apostolic blessing upon all who help to promote the cause of sacred music.

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.CARM.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

THE HEART OF FATHER DAMIEN. By Vital Jourdan. Translated by Francis Larken and Charles Davenport. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1955. Pp. 426. $4.75.

While Father Jourdan first wrote of Father Damien twenty-four years ago, his work, amended and translated, with exceptionally fine illustrations has a great appeal even now to all who are familiar with the tale of the leper priest. Archbishop Cicognani, who in visiting the Hawaiian Islands learned more about Father Damien, states in his foreword: "The world calls him a hero and he was; but at the same time by his life of sacrifice most emphatically he manifested that he was a holy man who lives in charity, lives in God, and God in him."

The cause of the beatification of Father Damien has been officially taken up by the Holy See. The authors of the present volume have not omitted any words critical of the Flemish priest who, even before he died, became the center of world attention. Some who opposed Father Damien have achieved historical notice only by their lack of charity.

There are some shocking episodes in this work. The delay in answering Damien's appeal for a confessor is more scandalous than the letter of the bigot Hyde. Yet the one invested with that responsibility, his bishop, states in the funeral eulogy: "Father Damien seems to me to have been a hero more glorious than he who falls on the battlefield."

Because of the purpose of this work, there is a great deal of repetition. Yet the reviewer would hesitate to eliminate a single chapter or document. Like that of other martyrs to charity, the life of Father Damien is an open book. The only mystery unsolved is this: who permitted the body of Father Damien to be transferred from the island and people he loved to Belgium? His body should lie in the Cathedral of Our Lady of Peace in Honolulu.

MAURICE S. SHEEHY

THE NEW TESTAMENT. Rendered from the original Greek with explanatory notes. Pt. 1: The four Gospels. Translated by James A. Kleist. Pt. 2: Acts of the Apostles, Epistles, and Apocalypse. Translated by Joseph L. Lilly. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1954. Pp. XII + 690. $5.00. Text ed. $3.75.

This new version is the fruit of many years of devoted labor by two of our best known American biblical scholars, James A. Kleist, S.J., and Joseph L. Lilly, C.M., neither of whom could supervise its final completion and publication. Father Kleist, who died in 1949, prepared the translation of the Gospels and wrote a fine account of his purpose in what is called the General Foreword. The preface is by Joseph Husslein, from whom we learn that the "notes for the Four Gospels were largely composed by the Rev. Henry Wilmering, S.J.," one of the editors of the *Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture.* The translations and the introductions and notes for the Acts, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse were supplied by Father Lilly, who died in 1952. There is still some unclearness regarding the Introductory Note to the Gospels and the Introduction to each individual Gospel narrative. Presumably, they are by Father Kleist, whose genius is responsible for the work as a whole. Much to be desired is a history of this version from origin to final publication and also of the other translations which have appeared in English in the last decades. The student of the olden days, when only the Rheims-Douay version was available in our seminaries, would welcome the account of our progress in biblical scholarship.

Bruce and Company are to be complimented for having given us a substantial and usable book, well bound and beautifully printed, the most readable of the new versions from the standpoint of good publishing. Bold type for titles and chapter heads with ample margins and clear paragraph divisions with strong binding make the book most acceptable for student use.

The translation is directly from the Greek, from the critical text of the Spanish theologian, Joseph M. Bover, S.J., which is based on the Codex Vaticanus. (*Novi Testamenti Biblia Graeca et Latina,* Madrid, 1943.) Referring to his own work, Father Kleist clearly states the purpose of the translation. The "Principal object has been to render the Greek into such modern English as I felt would approve itself to American Catholics. . . . On this principle, then, I have avoided obsolescent words and expressions, such as 'thou', 'thee', 'ye', as well as words which, though listed in dictionaries as 'biblical', would not be readily understood by the average reader of today. The same purpose, moreover, called for a change in the word order or sentence structure of the original whenever it seemed that the requirements of current English or of clearness itself would be served by so doing" (pp. vi-vii).

If the student in former days yearned for a simpler and clearer translation than the Rheims-Douay version, the very abundance of versions today must tend to confuse us in the midst of our gratitude for noble achievement in the study of the Written Word. Controversy on the relative merits of the five translations, that of Knox and of Lattey in England, and the three done in America, the Confraternity revision, that of Spencer, and the Kleist-Lilly, has remained on a very dignified plane and proved very fruitful. In works of such magnitude only the boldest would maintain that we have a version without fault.

In this regard it is to be regretted that neither of the distinguished scholars could see the work to its completion and be responsible for its final form. Possibly this might explain a number of surprising omissions, e.g. in *I Cor.* 13: 11, the words, "I felt as a child"; in *I Cor.* 13: 13, the words, "these three"; in *I Cor.* 9: 12, the important phrase, "but we bear all things." Even the casual reader cannot fail to note that a considerable number of texts are almost verbatim the same as those of the Confraternity revision of *Acts,* e.g. 7:2-5. Competent biblical scholars have pointed out other defects which, we have every right to assume, would not have escaped the vigilant eye of the translators had they been given the opportunity of final revision.

Critical interest in this Kleist-Lilly version centers on the common Greek and the common English. One of the best known authorities in the field of *Koine* Greek was Joseph Kleist, who was born in Germany, joined the Jesuits in Holland (when Jesuits were not permitted in Germany) and in his mature years came to the United States. His life was spent primarily in teaching and writing in the field of classical grammar and philology, from which he turned to the study of the New Testament and the Fathers. He spent some time at the University of Berlin specializing in the study of *Koine* Greek. Father Lilly also was outstanding in biblical scholarship.

The modern idiom is apparent from the very beginning in the omission of the "begot" with the sensible substitution of "Abraham was the father of Isaac, etc." Instead of "jot or tittle" we have "not a single letter or one small detail," instead of mammon we have the word, "money," instead of Lord the simple address, "Sir." For herd of swine we have "herd of pigs." We have such intelligible words as "temple dues," "poll tax," "landowner." "Perdition awaits you" is the rather prosaic expression replacing the time-honored "woe." The robbers or thieves on the cross are "rebels." "I am with you at all times as long as the world will last" takes the place of the "behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world." "Behold" becomes "look." The "publican" becomes "tax collector." The prodigal son "cashed everything" before he left home for the wide world of pleasure. Time is expressed no longer by "third" or "sixth" "hour," but by "nine in the morning," "noon," etc. We have the "last part of the night" instead of the fourth watch. Most striking are the changes in much-used texts: "the word was made man" takes the place of "the Word was made flesh."

Typical Hebraisms are put into modern speech and become more intelligible. But striking is the stress of the narrative present expressed in the matter-of-fact and realistic manner: "Look, there is the Lamb of God." "Well, come and see." "Yes, so it really is." "Long live the king of the Jews." "Simon, Simon, mark my words" (*Luke* 22:31). Typical examples are the account of the finding of Jesus as told in *Luke* 3:46 ff., and the incident of Mary and Martha narrated in *Luke* 10:38 ff.

The changes in the form of the beatitudes, the Our Father, the "Hail Mary," the Magnificat, Nunc Dimittis, Benedictus, etc. may create shock and concern in some quarters, but are openly welcomed by those who have followed Father Kleist's method of translation in the last decade with approval. Orators will be distressed by the absence of the "Amen, amen" which they find so forceful in sermons.

Much light is shed on the principles underlying his translations into modern form by Father Kleist's own explanation. In an article in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* for June, 1944, he says, "the Gospels are couched in the language of the day, devoid of rhythm or any other stylistic grace. Their diction is that of the lower strata of Greek, called the vernacular Koine." But a note in the same article informs us that there is "plenty of 'structural' rhythm even in the gospels." His position is that the modern translators must "seize the 'spirit' or genius of present-day English. Only when this is done can we speak of translation." Looking upon translation as "an intensely personal affair" and as essentially impermanent, he says "it constantly requires re-doing." How closely he adheres to his own principle is evident from a comparison of his translations of gospel passages in this same article with the Kleist translation before us.

The study of the new version in the light of Father Kleist's own detailed explanation shows how sympathetically he enters into the spirit of the original and carries out the advice of the Sovereign Pontiff in the *Divino Afflante Spiritu:* "it is the duty of the exegete to lay hold, so to speak, with the greatest care and reverence of the very least expressions which, under the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, have flowed from the pen of the sacred writer, so as to arrive at a deeper knowledge of the meaning."

In the judgment of John L. McKenzie, S.J., in his review for the October, 1954, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* the work of Father Lilly "does not quite attain the same level" as that of Kleist, but the "difference is one of small detail." This view is shared by James A. Brennen in his enthusiastic appraisal of the new translation in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* of March, 1955: "Most of the virtues, and more of the faults, of the Gospels will be found in the Epistles, translated by Father Lilly. There is the same bold approach and extensive use of paraphrase. . . . Father Lilly, striving at all costs to be intelligible, is usually successful, but does not inspire the same confidence as his fellow-translator" (p. 199).

In any translation the problem of accuracy and fidelity to the original is paramount, but nowhere is this so much a duty as in dealing with the inspired word. The difficulty is compounded when we must translate deeply hidden dogmatic meanings, whose richness is not readily learned from the non-sacred literature of the times. To cite but one example, how shall he translate the *metanoia* in the Gospels? In his *Memoirs of St. Peter,* Father Kleist translates the Marcan verse (1:4), "he . . . preached a baptism of conversion for forgiveness of sin," which in the present translation has been made to read, "John . . . appeared in the desert to preach a baptism which signified a change of heart and looked to forgiveness of sin." Elsewhere he also uses the "change of heart." The other translations uniformly use the term repent, penance, etc. We have a similar problem in dealing with such notions as *ecclesia, presbyteros, episcopos,* etc.

The new version is excellent in point of clearness and intelligibility. One may well turn from the other versions and find in this (with the remarkably simple and clear notes) a "self-commentary."

Unavoidably many will be offended at the revolutionary change of the time-honored words and phrases which have become a part of our language of instruction and piety. The question uppermost in the mind of this reviewer was: how acceptable is this new English style in point of beauty and rhythm? The common Greek has become common English with little of the flow and charm which we constantly associated with the sacred lines. It was Newman who spoke of the "music of the English Bible." It was Faber who referred to the "uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible [which] lives on in the ear like a music that never can be forgotten, like the sound of church bells which the convert hardly knows how he can forego." And strangely enough, it was "not the language of